Bishop Alois Karl Hudal

The Foundations of National Socialism

An Intellectual-Historical Investigation

Sonnet 4.5 Translation

THE FOUNDATIONS OF NATIONAL SOCIALISM

BISHOP DR. ALOIS KARL HUDAL

THE FOUNDATIONS OF NATIONAL SOCIALISM

AN INTELLECTUAL-HISTORICAL INVESTIGATION

ORIGINAL GERMAN PUBLISHED BY JOHANNES GÜNTHER VERLAG, LEIPZIG & VIENNA,

A.D. 1936

BISHOP ALOIS HUDAL DURING A LECTURE IN VIENNA IN APRIL 1937

THIS BOOK, WHICH IS WRITTEN WITH
MY HEART'S BLOOD, I DEDICATE TO THE INNER PEACE OF OUR GERMAN PEOPLE

† BISHOP HUDAL

Bishop Dr. Alois Hudal, The Foundations of National Socialism

Adolf Hitler, "Mein Kampf," pp. 124-125:

> *"Whoever believes he can arrive at a religious reformation by way of a political organization shows only that he lacks even a glimmer of understanding of the becoming of religious conceptions or even doctrines of faith and their ecclesiastical effects."*

Molotov before the Executive Committee of the Third International:

> *"The world revolution is in the greatest danger if there should come to be an ideological and organizational understanding between the Catholic and Fascist Internationale. The Comintern must prevent the same, and on German soil the struggle between these powers will come to pass."*

"Neue Zeitung" of January 22, 1934

AD LECTOREM

This volume presents a complete English translation of Bishop Alois Hudal's *Die Grundlagen des Nationalsozialismus* (1936), prepared for research in the fields of Church history, political theology, and the intellectual history of mid-twentieth-century Europe.

The translation is offered to document and facilitate academic study. It does not constitute an endorsement of the positions articulated by the author, nor should it be construed as promoting any particular ideology.

This translation serves as a humble aid for those not learned in the German language. It cannot and does not replace the original work. For all scholarly purposes, the German edition remains the authoritative text, and all citations must refer to the original prototype as the definitive source.

Translation completed using Claude Sonnet 4.5 (Anthropic, 2025).

In servitium scientiae.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MOVEMENT	13
§ 1.	PHILOSOPHICAL PIONEERS	22
§ 2.	HISTORICAL PREPARATORY WORKS	33
§ 3.	POETS & CULTURAL PHILOSOPHERS AS NATIONAL CHAMPIONS	35
§ 4.	SOCIAL PREPARATORY WORKS	39
III.	THE RELIGIOUS, MORAL, AND HISTORICO-PHILOSOPHICAL DOCTRINES OF NATIONAL SOCIALISM	43
§ 1.	THE CONCEPT OF WORLDVIEW	43
§ 2.	POSITIVE CHRISTIANITY	49
§ 3.	THE RACE PROBLEM	58
§ 4.	THE JEWISH QUESTION (ANTISEMITISM)	73

CONTENTS

§ 5.	THE PROBLEM OF RACIAL INFLUENCE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF WESTERN CHRISTIANITY	86
§ 6.	STERILIZATION & EUGENICS	115
§ 7.	NATION & NATIONALITY: NATIONAL-POLITICAL EFFORTS TOWARD THE UNITY OF THE GERMANS IN THE EUROPEAN SPHERE	131
§ 8.	THE CONCEPT OF THE STATE & LEADERSHIP: LAW, POWER & MORALITY; ROMAN & GERMAN LAW; THE POLITICAL ORDER CONCEPT	150
§ 9.	THE TOTALITARIAN STATE, CULTURAL UNITY & EDUCATION	175
§ 10.	RELIGION, PASTORAL CARE, POLITICS & POLITICAL CATHOLICISM	181
§ 11.	ROME & THE GERMAN PEOPLE; NATIONAL CHURCH MOVEMENTS; ROMANISM & CATHOLICISM	196
IV.	CONCLUDING REMARKS	226
V.	NOTES	246
§ I.	INTRODUCTORY MATTERS	246
§ II.	THE BECOMING OF THE MOVEMENT	253
§ III.	RELIGIOUS, MORAL & PHILOSOPHY-OF-HISTORY TEACHINGS OF NATIONAL SOCIALISM	266
§ IV.	CONCLUSION	304

I. INTRODUCTION.

The author of this book, as Rector of the venerable German National Foundation of de Anima, whose history is most intimately connected with the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, was invited by the Reich German Catholic community to serve as the first German-speaking foreign bishop at the great May celebration of the German Community of Rome in the year 1933. This celebration united over 700 persons in the festival hall of the Anima with the Bishop of Aachen, the two ambassadors of the Reich, the leaders of the Stahlhelm group, the NSDAP, the SA, and Hitler Youth in a demonstration of national solidarity and shared destiny unique for Germans abroad. At the welcoming ceremony, he spoke the following words, which, despite later disappointments from individual National Socialist party adherents, have lost nothing of their timeliness and significance:

"In this fateful hour, the foreign German Catholics greet the coming German Reich, whose foundations are to be built upon loyalty to Christ and loyalty to the people. Joyfully and proudly they confess with the German classical writer: 'Cling to the fatherland, the dear one.' The glorious past of the German people becomes alive again. The more the rootless elements disappear from public life—those who in the days of the overthrow dishonored the German

military estate and dragged through the mud with it everything that was great and holy in German history—the more powerfully shall the great ethnic idea awaken, the sublime consciousness of the unity of all Germans in language and culture. Thus we will combat every falsely understood pacifism that would leave eternal chains on our hands with slogans, chains forged by unworthy peace treaties, and reconquer for German youth the capacity for defense as the high value of manly virtue. Even if in the days of the World War's end, when the storm floods of revolution swept filth over the German fatherland, whether Germany or Austria, the lightning seemed to strike the German oak, the root itself has remained unharmed. Thus for us, national sentiment and Catholic faith, Christianity and ardent passion for people and homeland are no contradictions. Even if we as Catholics in Rome possess citizenship, we can nevertheless proudly make the confession before all the world: I am a Roman citizen, I am a German citizen, because only from the unity of all well-disposed and religiously firmly rooted persons can the new great German fatherland—for which a century's best German forces have struggled longingly—rise like a fortress and island of peace from the stormy floods of contemporary history. On the foundations of this Reich, however, shall stand those words that are engraved in Arminius's sword at the monument of the Teutoburg Forest: 'German unity my strength, my strength Germany's power,' and those others that are to be read at the Heroes' Monument in Vienna: 'Justice is the foundation of realms.'"

It was thus a fulfillment of duty for the German bishop in Rome to take a position in such a significant hour and to chart a path for German Catholics.

For years the author, even before the party had come to power and engagement with its specialized literature became necessary or at least advisable for many, had worked through the

most important works of its leading personalities out of an old interest in similar national and cultural currents in the Habsburg Monarchy, which coincided with his earliest childhood memories in his German border homeland. Various connections of a worldview nature therefore became ever more comprehensible to him, connections that many Reich German Catholics often had to miss because they could not experience the awakening of the nationalities in Austria in the nineties. Much that was already expressed then in the old Habsburg Monarchy by German politicians, poets, and artists in word and writing appears in our days as something new, although it is often only thought patterns of old liberalism that are revived by those who have not yet found the synthesis of Christianity and national attitude and are more intimately interwoven with the German unity idea. Added to this were the worldview struggles that seized all peoples of Europe since the nineties and soon merged with simultaneous national currents.

In the tremendous secularization process of the nineteenth century, which loosened every inner bond of the spiritual to unchangeable foundations, two myths have been able to occupy the religious void in man who has emerged from liberal, Marxist-influenced school instruction: the deified nation and the utopia of the anational classless society. Nationalists wanted to heal the world through the ethnic essence, socialists through the proletarian essence. First in France nationalism was developed into a kind of religiosity. Soon there was a mysticism, a dogma, a cult that was "integral," that is, translated into our present-day language, totalitarian, all-encompassing, a worldview. Blood, race, and soil become vital symbols in Maurice Barrès. This national movement further became decidedly counterrevolutionary, that is, directed against 1789: antidemocratic in the name of a hierarchical order, antiparliamentary in trust in the authority of leading elites, anti-centralist in order to

restore full life to the province. The leading theoretical mind, Charles Maurras, the director of Action Française, has ordered the driving ideas and systematized them in a totality-worldview.

In the Great War this nationalism seemed to have burned itself out. The world construction of the League of Nations might have indicated this. But the course of history went in another direction. Especially the spiritual upheaval of the postwar period in German-speaking territory has brought about profound religious and cultural revolutions and supplied nationalism with new energies. Questions that previously were touched upon only cautiously from the chairs of German universities have today become common property. Treitschke's word seems to prove true in light of the tension between Christianity and the ethnic cultural ideal: that the twentieth century will also bring the decision about the form of Christianity's continued leading position in Europe. Not only the Catholic but also the Protestant faith-heritage is affected in essential foundations and dogmas. Thus an examination of the religious, philosophical, and general cultural foundations of National Socialism, this strongest current of the twentieth century, appears necessary and clarifying for Catholics, but also for the faith-loyal Protestant adherents of the party who have joyfully greeted this great movement but often live in a conflict of conscience because by individual adherents worldview problems are carried into the national and social-reformatory program of National Socialism that per se have nothing to do with National Socialism. This conflation is all the more dangerous because it damages the German cultural idea within the Reich's borders and in its effect on the entire German language area, especially on those parts that have been cut off from the mother people by the peace treaties in order to be displaced from that holy soil—consecrated and saturated with the German blood of centuries—through a tenacious denationalization policy and

economic strangulation. Precisely in these parts of the German language area, National Socialism was longingly greeted like a liberation hour from ethnic oppression. Not only Protestants but above all Catholics in German lands abroad have placed the greatest expectations on the movement and expected from it at least the strengthening of cultural connection with Germandom in the Reich. A strong Germany will never tolerate that its national minorities in Europe be treated as has been permitted since 1918. Many have not found the bridge and have stopped halfway; individuals reject National Socialism in advance without even asking about the positive values contained in its program; others perhaps go along in painful feelings, from compulsion and fear. Of opportunists who accompany every political movement there shall be no discussion here. But countless loyal sons of the German people who see in National Socialism the last barrier to keep the Bolshevism threatening Europe from German soil are convinced that the great German unity movement would have to suffer in its momentum and conquest drive through the introduction of worldview controversies.

The present book is conceived as an attempt to pave a way from the Christian standpoint to an understanding of National Socialism. The Church looks back on the historical experience of 1900 years; National Socialism does not yet represent something finished but is, as the concepts blood, race, soil and ground already indicate, still in the process of becoming without historical experiences. Therefore the author intentionally avoids utilizing, say, the anti-Church statements of individual National Socialist subordinate leaders and unauthorized assembly speakers, as much polemic does so frequently to the damage of German prestige abroad. Only the actual intellectual leaders of the party and the genuine bearers of the movement come to word in this work, no one else. Party movements must not be judged only by their program,

which usually loves generally held expressions and formulations, but by the leading literature that has become, as it were, the spiritual countenance of the movement. The author has therefore left none of the great works of National Socialist literature unconsidered. Everything that has significance was included in order to obtain an objective judgment. Only he who follows the becoming of a political movement can also have a judgment about its ultimate goals and results. Thus the catalog of works published by the Party Publishing House Eher-Munich was constantly used, since precisely this is to be regarded as the official register of the authoritative literature. Only according to these writers, in whom the ideal of the National Socialist worldview comes to expression most purely, shall a judgment be rendered in what follows. Therefore in the marginal notes of the individual sections, the necessary literature was also given as an appendix to provide orientation for further studies. But since only the possibility of a polemic in intellectual history can best work out the essential points of cultural currents, the official party literature had to be joined by that of the critics of Catholic and Protestant confession. Thus the present book is the first intellectual-historical engagement between National Socialism and Catholicism, in a broader sense with Christianity in general. But since National Socialism is a living movement and much is still in full flux, in many things this can only be a beginning, not always a conclusive judgment. The goal of this work is thus more to prepare a clarification in matters of principle, which also from the Protestant side the old fighter of the National Socialist movement, theology professor Gaius Fabricius, has attempted in his just-published writing. National Socialism does not want to be and remain an ordinary political movement, as, say, the German National Party in Austria formerly was, which placed only the Greater German unification idea at the center of its program. National Socialism also does not place some

"ideas" into the world, but a consistently willed unified sequence of ideas, in other words an uncompromising system. Thus Adolf Hitler could also declare at the Culture Conference of the Reich Party Congress 1934: "The National Socialist Revolution would never have succeeded if it did not come from worldview foundations. With that, however, it will not only change the external life and power image of the German people but also give a new expression to its cultural formation." Doubtless these words are intended only on the basis of the party program, Article 24, thus not in an opposition to Christianity. But the matter becomes much more difficult when one examines the interpretation attempts of various writers on these significant words of the solely authorized leader of the movement. Immediately the question arises:

Where is this worldview of National Socialism most clearly expressed? Is this concept to be taken only in the political or in the philosophical-historical-cultural sense?

The deeper and ultimate meaning of this book is thus to seek an answer to two questions that force themselves upon every attentive observer of the National Socialist movement and whose uncertainty has had so many conflicts of conscience, tactical errors, and false judgments as consequences, because one heeded only peripheral program parts but not the essence:

1. Can one speak at all of two directions within National Socialism: a left-radical one that presses forward unrestrained, has never grasped the essence of Christianity, and strives for a complete deconfessionalization of all spheres of public life and a pushing back of religion into the space of the churches—and a right, more conservative wing that is conscious of the values of religion, especially of Christianity, for its own German people and strives with honest will for a synthesis of religious and national feeling that corresponds to modern thinking? Is for the knowledge and judgment of National

Socialism Article 24 of the party program alone authoritative, or the scholarly literature often used as a basis in training courses, work camps, etc.? Is especially Rosenberg's book "The Myth of the Twentieth Century," which was sunk with other documents into the foundation stone of the new party congress hall at the Nuremberg Party Congress on September 11, 1935, the gospel or the catechism of the Third Reich? Since Haeckel's "World Riddles," no other German book has caused such a large and passionate counter-literature as Rosenberg's "Myth," although his views had been presented for decades by Protestant theology professors from the pulpits and lecterns of Germany (compare the "cases" Schrempf, Jatho, Traub!). It would be impossible here to name even approximately this literature, but it can suffice to bring the main works in order to be able to orient oneself further. About the significance of this book within the National Socialist program, the well-known writer Stapel spoke in his journal "German Peopledom" (1935), p. 727:

"The fact is that Rosenberg received his worldview function from Adolf Hitler. Thus one must either admit that Rosenberg's worldview is National Socialist in full scope, but that a National Socialist can nevertheless have a different relationship to Christianity than Rosenberg, or one must say that Hitler acted against National Socialism through the commissioning of Rosenberg. But this would be absurd. It will not do to cut Rosenberg himself into a National Socialist public half and a non-National Socialist private half."

Noteworthy is the judgment in the "Völkischer Beobachter" of June 7, 1934: "'The Myth of the Twentieth Century,' which has laid a new worldview foundation, is so strongly and securely grounded and so greatly conceived in design and form that the new Germany can confidently build upon it the edifice of a new political and spiritual life. One asks oneself astonished how a work about such

difficult and complicated questions could pour so quickly into the widest circles of the people. The answer is not difficult to give: The powerful work is the fulfillment of a longing of all Germans. It outlines the concept of blood and honor."

Is the essence of National Socialism, as it reveals itself in this literature, so un-Christian that from it a second Reformation in the sense of the pantheism of Goethe and Hegel threatens the German people, and therefore a division into two directions appears not at all justified, or can the attempt be justified to create bridges and approaches from National Socialism to Christianity? In other words, must the worldview struggle be essentially connected with National Socialism, or would it not be possible to develop this great movement in the sense of its origin as a purely political program that only wants Germany's greatness but leaves the religious sphere of adherents untouched as an inviolable sanctuary?

2. Has National Socialism not also brought good, valuable stimulations to the German people, so that for this reason alone a support of the movement by religiously positively disposed people is not only desirable but absolutely necessary in order to bring about the religious clarification, above all the separation of the purely political from the worldview, which Hitler outlined as directive for the party in his book "Mein Kampf" with his thoughts on religion, politics, worldview, and the Away-from-Rome movement? Does not the word of Saint Thomas Aquinas also apply to this movement, that even in the errors and mistakes of humanity something of truth always shines through? "It is impossible that there be any knowledge that is totally false without admixture of any truth... it contains some true things through which it is made receivable." (Summa Theologiae, II/II q. 172, a. 6 c.) How valuable are, for example, to extract only a few thoughts, the following program points of National Socialism, which are certainly partly not new but were expressed decades earlier

by far-sighted personalities but were completely buried in the mud of postwar psychosis: People's community over dividing obstacles, language as the spiritual space of the nation, the strong longing for a new German life-ideal, the consciousness of German destiny in history, the connectedness with one's own race, the attempt at a solution of the Jewish question, care for a racially healthy German offspring, the destruction of the party system, the elimination of the too strong mixing of religion and politics, family care, abundance of children as honor and national pride, capacity for defense in order to defend the vital demands of German politics against a Europe bristling with weapons, sacrifice-ready affirmation of the German community of destiny, the Reich idea, the preparing renewal of the educational system, the corporate idea, the aristocratic leadership principle, settlement and work camps, population policy—all this is conservative thought-heritage that must be counted among the strong, recruiting forces of the movement. Above all, however, the German people owe to this intellectual movement the undermining of the human rights ideology that bore the Weimar structure, further the destruction of faith in formal legal constructions, in the dialectic of previous parliamentary life and democracy.

National Socialism thus belongs within the ideal movements of the twentieth century and can only be recognized and judged in its essence in connection with the entire line of development of the nineteenth century. In history there are no unmediated transitions, no becoming out of itself. Everything is rooted in preceding thoughts and currents. Just as the Fascism of Italy and the Bolshevism of Russia, the national movement in Germany is also not only a conclusion but the beginning of a cultural turn, the fading out of an intellectual development that reaches back decades and whose course of development was often not observed by those who could not follow with attentive gaze the nationalism in the

distinctive stamp of Austria, Bavaria, and Baden and the religious disintegration of Protestantism through the scholarship of the nineteenth century. Especially the works of Rosenberg are a classical example of this. They are the reflection of numerous preceding errors and one-sided historical views, a true Pandora's box of most peculiar ideas, bold constructions, and distinctive perspectives on the development of races and religions.

The author's book therefore gives a completely dispassionate, sober presentation from the intellectual-historical standpoint. It raises no reproaches, conducts no purposeless polemic, builds no emergency bridges that would benefit neither Christianity nor the National Socialist movement. The book further wants to be taken as a whole. Whoever tears individual passages, texts, and formulations out of context and uses them for one-sided propaganda would benefit neither the German cause nor the sense-giving of this book. Its goal is rather to make the great movement more comprehensible as a necessary result from the preceding intellectual struggles in the German people and from the unheard-of undignified treatment that has befallen the German people in foreign policy since 1918 and that has essentially co-caused the German imperialism of nation and race. One cannot admit rank-differences of peoples in a Christian Europe, as the peace treaties wanted to establish for eternal times. But the goal of this work is also to judge National Socialism by the crystal-clear clarity of Catholic teaching. Thus the following work serves clarification, which in a time of great conceptual unclarity and falsification of history must be welcomed by everyone who is honest with the German people and Christianity. It shall help so that the national movement frees itself from worldview errors that initially were not, or at least not essentially, connected with it and today, despite a powerfully developed organization, threaten the inner strength of National Socialism, to which Providence has

transferred the great task of being in Europe with Fascism the firm bulwark against the flood waves of Asiatic cultural Bolshevism that today threatens all states and peoples in equal measure. Even the organization cannot replace a solid foundation for the long term. Only thus can the German longing of a century become living reality: the cultural unification of Germans in the European space, without a millennium of German history in the shadow of Christianity having to collapse over it.

Thus let this writing be consecrated to the two sublime thoughts that should be the center of life and work for every German-speaking Catholic: For the Church and for the Nation.

Rome, on July 11, 1936, the day of understanding
between Germany and Austria.

II. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MOVEMENT.

The intellectual homeland of National Socialism, if one disregards the more distant pioneers of the national cause in general —Fichte, Arndt, Jahn, Görres, who were simultaneously German and Christian in their convictions—was not Germany at all, but rather old Austria, and even there only a specific region of the Habsburg Monarchy bounded by the lands of Styria, Carinthia, and the German-settled Sudetenland (Bohemia, Moravia). The national idea had awakened early in this multi-ethnic state. A journeyman printer gathered like-minded individuals there for the struggle over ethnic identity and political worldview against Czechs and Marxists. They founded the "German Workers' Party" of Austria, from which in 1917 the German National Socialist movement emerged, whose programmatic theorist, Engineer Rudolf Jung, two years later wrote the book on "National Socialism." The swastika and hammer were symbols of this ethnic German movement, whose leading men—Hans Knirsch, Rudolf Jung, Hans Krebs, and Franz Jesser—possessed general significance.

Thus the German youth in Austria—Catholicism only became more strongly conscious again of its leadership vocation in ethnic matters there at the turn of the twentieth century—received a different political formation from that in the German Reich. They

were placed harshly and immediately before tasks, questions, and decisions that the Reich did not know. The danger of crumbling borders, the distress of Germans in the frontier zones and in dispersion created an entirely different atmosphere here. The ethnic struggle stood vividly before everyone: the struggle for farm and field in the German regions of Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia, in South Tyrol, in southern Carinthia, southern Styria, and at the borders of the German settlement area toward the east. Thus arose the national protective associations for schools and border settlement (Southern March), the former a work of the South Tyrolean priest Mitterer. This struggle of attrition against Germandom also shaped, ethnically speaking, a different type of person in Austria who stood more receptive to national questions. Tyrol and Salzburg were the last lands of old Austria to be seized by the national movement, with the exception of the cities, and even in recent years, when this national idea had long since been undermined by liberal elements, both lands were by no means drawn into the National Socialist movement through kindred intellectual convictions, but almost exclusively through economic considerations—if one disregards the liberal teaching profession, the civil service, and the small bourgeois intellectual stratum, who were religiously moribund and had changed flag and program countless times in party politics since 1890. The strong following of National Socialism in Tyrol and Salzburg had almost nothing to do with genuine national idealism, because the border region problem was not as pressing there until the end of the World War as in the other German regions of old Austria. In Styria and Carinthia and in the Sudeten region, two historical facts above all prepared the way for the movement. First was the harsh national struggle against the advancing Slavdom, which since the eighteen-eighties sought to implement a purposeful conquest plan for German soil. From the south pressed the South Slavic state idea, supported

by the Orthodox Serbian national church; in the northeast it was the Czechs, whose radical forces worked toward the complete displacement of Germandom in Bohemia and Moravia and also achieved substantial successes. As a second deeply regrettable phenomenon and contributing cause that the national movement in precisely these lands had anti-ecclesiastical goals from the beginning, liberalism must be named, which since the age of Josephinism until the eighteen-seventies—partially supported by the imperial court and its bureaucracy—spread unchecked in cities and market towns and also found adherents and defenders among the clergy. (Thus Catholic clergy were also elected as deputies in the liberal parties.) Very characteristic of the religious degradation in these German-speaking lands is the fact that already among the actual advisors and promoters of the church reforms of Joseph II, which had effects lasting into the eighteen-nineties, was a Catholic bishop, Count Auersperg of Gurk. Unfortunately, to this day we lack a history of Josephinism and thereby of religious life in Austria for the nineteenth century, in order to properly evaluate the struggles of this state church system that paralyzed Catholicism there. Perhaps certain character traits of the German tribes inhabiting Styria and Carinthia also produced a freer conception of life than we encounter among the other tribes (Alemanni, Western Bavarians). Of greatest significance was further that in the Reformation of the sixteenth century, wide regions of Austria had become almost completely Protestant and only later did a sometimes forcibly implemented Counter-Reformation revive the declining Catholicism. At that time, with a peculiar force, between and above Catholicism and Protestantism, a religious movement with strong national characteristics thrust itself forward. The memory of these religious struggles has not died out among the peasantry and in the educated circles of my homeland to this day. But one would have to write the

history of the cultural disintegration of the old monarchy to understand how many religious, cultural, and political currents of the nineteenth century ultimately flowed together into a strong unified national movement. Thus the ethnic movement in old Austria bore not only very early—almost in its birth hour—liberal features, but already in the eighteen-nineties a decidedly anti-Roman affect. It therefore fell ever more strongly into the wake of Protestant conquest plans (Away-from-Rome movement, Protestant League, Gustav Adolf Association), which in clever tactics exploited for these purposes the German School Association, which built national defensive schools in the border region; further the Southern March, which primarily settled German Protestants from the Reich there because Catholics were presented as too unreliable in national matters; the gymnastic movement of Jahn; and the press. Anyone who compares the speeches of certain representatives of these associations and organizations, as well as the language of the German-national newspapers of Austria in the years 1890 to 1914, with the leading literature of today's National Socialism will find surprising parallels. The ideological foundations emerge already in these years with ever greater clarity. Especially the long-standing intellectual leader of the Pan-German movement in Austria that he created, the Sudeten German Georg Ritter von Schönerer, under whose oratorical influence stood the entire educated stratum of Germans in the Habsburg Monarchy (compare the memoirs of Hermann Bahr), gave the party—after the departure of Friedjung—a decidedly antisemitic and anti-ecclesiastical character. Many missteps occurred precisely in these years of struggle, which prepared the ground for the worldview side of National Socialism, on the part of individual ecclesiastical offices in the appointment of clergy in nationally threatened areas. Devastating was the influx of Czech clerics, often inadequate not only linguistically, into Carinthia, Styria,

and purely German-speaking communities of the Sudeten region, after priestly vocations from German families had become ever rarer under the influence of the national movement. A shocking picture of intellectual shortsightedness and national radicalism reveals itself when one statistically reviews these conditions with the uncanny decline of the entire ecclesiastical life under the impact of national liberalism. Slogans against Rome and political Catholicism and Christianity in general accompanied this religious decline. The Away-from-Rome movement, which unfortunately was regarded by many as an essential accompanying phenomenon of the German national movement in Austria, led hundreds of thousands of Catholics in the Austrian Alpine lands and the Sudeten region to Protestantism, which was presented as the religious expression of Germandom (physicians, professors, officials; in many student fraternities, apostasy from the faith was a precondition for full membership). Especially the position taken by the "Catholic People's Party," the Alpine Catholic Imperial Party, on the Baden Language Ordinances was exploited to cast suspicion on the national convictions of German Catholics in general, to declare the Catholic Church itself as anti-German, Protestantism as the German church. Supported by the "Protestant League" and the "Gustav Adolf Foundation" in Germany, an apostasy movement was initiated in all German regions of Austria, which had to be served by political assemblies, Protestant family evenings, and anti-Catholic pamphlets and periodicals ("Der Scherer" since 1905; "Die Wartburg" and others) in order to carry Protestant ideas into Catholic circles. They found easier hearing especially among the religiously lukewarm intelligentsia because they appeared under popular national slogans. Numerous churches were built with foreign money, pastors and itinerant preachers from the German Reich were called into the country, even the parliamentary stage was used to conduct anti-Catholic recruitment. A second

Reformation was then created among the Germans of Austria. This struggle was intensified on the occasion of the Borromeo Encyclical (1910), in which Pius X had characterized the curse of the Reformation. The specially formed "Committee for the Promotion of the Protestant Movement in Austria" boasted already in 1910 of having distributed more than two million writings. The contributions of the "Protestant League" reached 200,000 Reichsmarks quarterly in 1901; the "Gustav Adolf Foundation" devoted 400,000 Reichsmarks for church construction. The "Protestant League" in Germany alone maintained 100 vicars. From 1899 to 1904, in Bohemia alone 31 new churches and 97 preaching stations were established; in all Austria from 1897 to 1907, 110 churches and chapels were consecrated, 220 preaching positions newly established, the number of clergy in Bohemia increased from 28 to 62 through influx from outside. The success, though it fell short of the effort, was nevertheless extremely sad. The interconfessional laws of 1868 had resulted in Austria in a confessional statistical shift to the disadvantage of Catholics by two percent. Compared to this loss, the apostasy figures of the Away-from-Rome movement remained relatively small: 1897 to 1900—10,000; 1900 to 1934—34,000, of which 9,000 to Old Catholicism; over one-third of these became confessionless. On the Protestant side, one reported up to 1907 46,400 conversions to the Protestant confession, 13,500 to the Old Catholic confession. Besides Bohemia, Vienna provided the strongest contribution to these sad figures in a land that was for the most part Catholic. It must not be overlooked that unfortunately precisely these regions of Austria afflicted by the Away-from-Rome movement later became the strongest bastions of National Socialism and have partially remained so to this day, and thereby simultaneously compromised the entire movement in the eyes of religiously minded people as a second Away-from-Rome

movement, which in fact it did not intend to be at all. Thus the cities and market towns of Austria presented, as a result of this manifest misuse of religion for political purposes since the eighteen-eighties, the picture of religious decay. The intellectual stratum, the better middle class, had lost its orientation toward the Church, while the common people in the countryside remained still believing or, insofar as they belonged to the working class, were up to eighty percent organized in Marxist trade unions. Unfortunately every religious statistic is lacking for the dioceses of Austria regarding church attendance, fulfillment of the Easter duty, ecclesiastical baptisms, in order to possess a true picture of Austrian Catholicism in this epoch, without knowledge of which the sliding of national thinking into an anti-Catholic intellectual posture cannot be understood. At that time, through individual radically disposed personalities who misused the Protestant League in Berlin and the Gustav Adolf Association, the slogan was also spread in Austria in word and writing that Catholic and national convictions were irreconcilable concepts. Many parishes were in this way religiously completely extinguished. Gradually, moreover, convinced Catholics were pushed out of all positions of public life. The suppression and disadvantaging of even the most capable Catholic men when applying for positions in the provinces, cities, and municipalities was presented as a national necessity. To place believing private lecturers at universities became an impossibility. In the midst of a Catholic state, faithful Catholics were merely tolerated and degraded to second-class citizens whose national convictions were disputed only because they had the courage to also practice their Christianity. The majority of the population was pressed down to helot status compared to the minority. Into this period falls also the slow awakening of Catholicism, whose leaders became individual bishops (Rudigier, Zwerger), outstanding ordinary priests (Opitz, Father Abel), and laymen.

Also in Germany, since the Kulturkampf, liberalism and an anti-Catholic posture were accompanying phenomena of the national idea, which however could never become as vital until the postwar period as in the ethnically threatened German-speaking regions of Austria. Manifold causes, which go back not least to French influences, promoted liberalism in Baden and Bavaria. In Bavaria, for several decades the Protestant element was purposefully favored in the civil service and even at the royal court.

But as much as these phenomena in old Austria and in individual parts of Germany explain much, National Socialism would never have become such a power if numerous currents in the philosophical, social, and legal spheres had not worked together. Politically, various parties prepared the ground. In Austria, these were the German Nationals, who however repeatedly changed name, program, and colors; the party of the Progressive Christians; the Democrats; the German Radicals; the Greater German direction; the organizations of the working class and peasantry (Farmers' League). In Germany, these were national parties of all shades.

Many leading personalities of these national parties and of the movement in general were unfortunately religiously liberal, anti-Catholic, or living in a peculiar religious world full of contradictions. In any case, however, they rejected any activity of religion beyond the space of the church.

If the national movement sought and found its most numerous adherents precisely from these religiously uprooted circles, it is by no means asserted thereby that the German unity idea and the honest will to defend Germandom were carried only by liberalism. Respected Catholics who practiced their religion provided the most valuable cooperation in national matters. There were German-minded priests and Catholic laymen who had to experience with deep sorrow how national convictions were ever more strongly

undermined by liberalism, which later generated Marxism as its legitimate son. The sliding of nationalism into anti-ecclesiastical trains of thought was admittedly also co-caused by the passive posture of some ecclesiastical offices, the lack of foresight regarding the scope of this movement in the Catholic camp, and on the other hand the provocative, imperious manner with which individual pastors in Austria wanted to preach undisturbed their equation of nation and Lutheranism.

The intellectual pioneers of National Socialism, which today attempts to establish a fixed, dogmatic, and ethical system and doctrinal edifice with specific conceptions and demands in the sphere of ethics and law, are thus, considered from the history of ideas, to be found in the most diverse areas of cultural life. A vast complex of ideas forms its presupposition. Only thus does one also partially understand the fact that the national idea in the German-speaking area was already in its first beginnings accompanied by an anti-ecclesiastical and anti-Roman conviction. Especially in Austria, already in the prewar period, the concepts German and Catholic-hostile coincided in most cases.

That the national movement in Italy took an anti-clerical direction is explained by the opposition to the Papal States, which was an obstacle to the unity of Italy. Here one comprehends, viewed purely historically, various psychological postures in the Risorgimento, which had an anticlerical character, although Catholic personalities also prepared the way for united Italy. The opposition to the Papal States confirmed the church-hostile posture of many circles of the national movement in Italy. In the German-speaking area there was nothing similar that would have justified, externally seen, this posture of awakening nationalism. Thus the deeper causes

of the anti-ecclesiastical character must be sought not in political but in worldview spheres. We can establish these preparatory works in various areas.

1. PHILOSOPHICAL PIONEERS.

One can readily strike from the so-called more distant pioneers of the national movement Master Eckhart, who as a brilliant creator of language introduced hundreds of philosophical and theological concepts into the German language, and Nicholas of Cusa. The former, successor to Thomas Aquinas in the Paris chair of the Dominicans and in that of Albertus Magnus in Cologne, was despite his Nordic origins and some disputed doctrinal propositions concerning the "birth of God" in the human soul no pantheist, no precursor of Nietzsche or of the German Faith Movement, which believed it could arrogantly despise the supernatural character of Christianity, but rather a believing Christian who wished to remain in the Church and had close connections with Neoplatonically oriented Jewish religious philosophy.

Master Eckhart, one of the great figures of the German Middle Ages, whom Romanticism first rediscovered, is especially stamped by the German Faith Movement—which wrongly regards itself as the purest herald of the National Socialist worldview—as a rebel against Roman Catholicism and "oriental" Christianity, since in him for the first time on German soil "the Nordic-Germanic, long-suppressed cosmic feeling for life and God had broken through in order to form itself into a racially appropriate, pantheistic, devout mysticism." Serious scholarship, which has not yet lost its objectivity, has meanwhile furnished proof that the assertion that in Eckhart a Germanic mysticism opposed to Christian piety had erupted is only arbitrary assumption based on falsely understood texts. It is rather

the old stream of Christian tradition flowing for over a century, in which Augustine, Christian Neoplatonism, the Gospel of John, and the Apostle Paul are represented. Master Eckhart's writings are not the documentary evidence of a "Germanic" Christianity that had not previously come into force, so that he also cannot be claimed as shield-bearer of a German national church. This dispute over Eckhart is also not from today, however topical it may present itself. Even the condemnation of Eckhart at that time, which was considerately carried out only after his death, was directed against unauthorized persons who had already then misunderstood him. Precisely the new edition of his Latin works proves that Eckhart was firmly rooted in the Christian past and was by no means the founder of religion emerging from German forest solitude. He stands as a mystic in worldwide connections that continue to lie in shadow. His greatness can only be measured against Neoplatonism and at centers of religious tradition located still further eastward and backward in time, with which he stands in relation as a scholastic thinker as well as a son of the Crusades epoch. One day it will be incomprehensible that one speaks of German mysticism without losing a word about Arabic, Indian, or Chinese absorption in God, and this blindness will require corrections just as serious as ignorance of scholastic theology. This is in no way meant to deny Eckhart's lasting influence on the development of national thought in Germany, ever since Franz von Baader rediscovered his German writings that had remained unnoticed for centuries and Hegel believed he saw his own philosophy preformed in Eckhart.

Nicholas of Cusa is also presented today as a pioneer of national thought and as crown witness of a pantheistic doctrine appropriate to the North German genius, which differs from Scholasticism because he assumes a non-rational, non-conceptual region of the spirit that is not subject to the laws of formal logic, but

also from mysticism because he sees within the mystical experience of God an irrational logos that also recurs in the Kantian "idea." This revelation of the German spirit was later destroyed by the French spirit (Descartes) breaking over Germany.

When one speaks today of a philosophical preparation for National Socialism, this concept must be taken in the broadest sense, for religion, morality, legal conceptions, and historical representation —in a word, the entire culture of Germany—was influenced decades earlier by a common direction of writers, poets, cultural philosophers, and actual philosophers, which is characterized by the names Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Dilthey, Chamberlain, the Bayreuth circle around Richard Wagner, Lagarde, and Spengler.

Schopenhauer (died 1866) will indeed hardly be counted among the pioneers by some representatives of National Socialism; nevertheless, his name cannot be passed over here, not only because he shares with Nietzsche a surprising spiritual abundance, but because he is called the only European event between Goethe and Nietzsche. As the principal representative of a voluntaristic metaphysics, he knew how to combine his pessimistic compassion ethics with a refinedly Machiavellian everyday morality. Through his educational background most deeply connected with the Enlightenment, man appears to him as the measure of all things; God and divine realms are removed from this worldview as empty illusions, and the will is elevated as dominant in man over against reason. Thus this edifice of thought is timely, since not a few representatives of National Socialism declare themselves weary of Christianity and look toward primordial Aryan India. A good portion of what today rumbles about as anti-Christian in some National Socialist circles is Schopenhauer's intellectual property.

Nietzsche (died 1900). No writer of the late nineteenth century exerted such a deep intellectual influence on the growing,

nationally minded youth of Germany—and we can say of the entire world—as the son of the pastor from Röcken near Leipzig, so modest in his life, who was already religiously disintegrated at sixteen years of age and soon under Schopenhauer's influence saw in Christianity only the symbolism of something still higher. Nietzsche, who himself stood more affirmingly toward French culture than toward German and counted the Pensées of the Jansenist Pascal as well as the works of Stendhal, Taine, and Voltaire among the deepest and most inexhaustible books, belonged to the most widely read writers at the front in the World War, and almost all thinkers of the last three decades fell under his spell unless they stood on a stronger Christian foundation. The brilliance of his aphorisms, passionate fervor and melodious rhythm, artistic form of the German language, which he mastered like scarcely anyone else since Goethe, enlarged his following no less than the fundamental doctrines of his ethics of power and force with their demand for a merciless striding over everything standing in the way. Many of his own word-creations have today become common property of the assembly speakers and propagandists of National Socialism (moraline, conceptual cripple, Renaissance virtue, back-worlders, socialist rabble, baseness of soul). In him the German soul, restless since Kant, Feuerbach, and Stirner, broke through as in an explosion, although he himself, viewed racially, was perhaps a mixed-blood and also passed very harsh judgments on the Germans and the "horned cattle" of nationalism. His works have nothing in common with ordinary popular enlightenment literature, but breathe a deep hatred against everything called religion, Christianity, and church; but his worldview is not gained by way of the intellect, but as a passion-laden upheaval of the entire inner man. The heroic ideal of life and the philosophy of vitality in the sense of the Renaissance is his goal, which displaces Schopenhauer's will and life pessimism, and not

virtue in the moral-Christian sense. He reproaches Christianity with loving and cultivating the diseased and weak and with speaking of sin, conscience, and humility instead of heroism. It is the philosophy of the will, of dynamics, of constant revolution in the sense of the idea of power, of assertion that will tolerate no contradiction and permits no criticism, of unconditional skepticism toward everything that the past believed as religious and moral truth, of affirmation of life and rejection of compassion together with morality, of rejection of every objectivity, the demand for strictest obedience even into the ultimate goals of his dictatorship, and the transvaluation of all values. It is Darwin's breeding upward, transferred to worldview, with a hatred against Christianity that increases with each year of his literary activity. It is self-deification as a religious substitute. In Nietzsche's worldview everything solid has become wavering; a boundless freedom of assumption, play with limitless possibilities let the spirit enjoy its sovereignty and simultaneously give it the pain of its emptiness. This pain of emptiness and homelessness of the soul, this consciousness of anarchy in all deeper convictions, this uncertainty about the values and goals of life speak movingly from many passages of his writings. He hated above all Catholicism.

To excuse Nietzsche's vituperations against Christianity in some way, it has been pointed out that he does not combat actual Christianity but the corrupted form in which it appeared in Schopenhauer, Pascal, Richard Wagner, and Leo Tolstoy ("What Is My Faith?"). In fact, the picture of "life-hostile Christian ethics" that Nietzsche draws for us is nothing other than a reflection of Schopenhauer's distortion of Christianity. It is also true that Nietzsche as "the most instructive victim of Christianity" cites Pascal again and again: "slowly murdered, first bodily, then psychically," he offers the best representation of the most dreadful form of inhuman cruelty. What finally concerns Richard Wagner, it may be that his

Parsifal piety was only an external playing with religious forms without inner conviction for the sake of mere "artistic success." One could ask, what has passed from Nietzsche's world of thought into the doctrine of some leading writers of National Socialism? Not the rejection of Christianity in general, but of an ecclesiastically dogmatically bound Christianity; the cult of the will; the drive toward power and heightened vital force; struggle as the highest form of education; the value of blood and race; of discipline and breeding of the noblest human types; of family history; of the favoring of those rich in children; the new responsibility of the physician for all in whom the highest interest of ascending life demands the ruthless pushing down and aside of degenerate life; the irrational, instinctual, and elemental. Blood, violence, myth, and race are the values upon which Nietzsche, together with Sorel's glorification of the incalculable, wants to build an entirely new society and political order after the ideas of democracy, humanity, and world brotherhood had lost their recruiting power. The journal "Will and Power," the leadership organ of National Socialist youth, writes on the occasion of an appreciation of this philosopher on November 1, 1934:

"Nietzsche overcame the enlightenment reason and intellectualism that had dominated philosophy until him, and set in their place a philosophy of vitality. According to him, not reason dominated life but the eternally restless instinctual will. With this Nietzsche expressed what has only today been fully recognized: that we had fallen into an overvaluation of the intellect. But simultaneously he set in place of Schopenhauer's will and life pessimism a heroic affirmation of will and life.

Out of this new attitude toward life, his hardest struggle is directed against all despisers of the body, the 'back-worlders,' a Christianity that relocates the center of gravity of being into the beyond, seeks to undermine the preservation instincts of strong life,

and teaches hatred against everything natural. But he wants no de-deification; no, Nietzsche is a person who, as no one has done for a long time before him, carries a deep religiosity within himself."

Even Nietzsche's disparaging remarks about the race question, antisemitism, and the total state ("where there are racial mixtures, there is the source of great culture," "associate with no person who takes part in the mendacious racial swindle," in "Will to Power," further Zarathustra, chapter "On the New Idol") could not prevent his philosophy of life from penetrating in its basic tendency —"turning away from the supernatural character of Christianity, turn toward a purely natural ideal of life and an ethnically closed being"—into the worldview of numerous representatives of National Socialism in a dominating and leading way. Without Nietzsche, who had his precursor in Stirner, according to the conception of these circles, National Socialism would lack an essential element of its entire system. Since Nietzsche pronounced the verdict of condemnation on Christian compassion morality and set in place of the allegedly whimpering slave humility of "Pauline Christianity" the honor of the high-minded superman heroically defending himself against suffering and all meaninglessness of the world, the irreconcilable opposition between consciousness of honor and humility has been proclaimed again and again, especially in Germany. Now the definitive judgment on the "Semitic disposition" of humility, which is "born from weakness and sterility," is supposed to be accomplished through the ethos of honor, which has sprung from the creative consciousness of power of a nobler race and to which alone the future of awakened humanity may belong. Although it has long been recognized in scholarly circles that Nietzsche in gross misunderstanding of Christian thought confused Schopenhauer's compassion with Catholic personal love, further that Jesus's teaching on humility remained or became completely foreign to him, the

alleged conflict between honor and humility is nevertheless simply believed as an axiom.

W. Dilthey, the Protestant pastor's son (died 1911), in whose pietistic parental home the dogmatic substance of Christianity had already evaporated, still stood in the midst of the world of naturalism, for which all being and becoming was only a structure of force and matter and for which man too counted only as a machine. His works "Experience and Poetry" and "Introduction to the Human Sciences" are a turning point in modern thought, although Dilthey too remained stuck in pantheism and sees worldview founded not in a logical order but in feelings and drives. He too never encountered the personality of Christ, and in this omission lies the tragedy of his worldview. He too, who believed in an unstoppable progress of humanity with pure this-worldliness of interests and in the dominion of science over life, felt that his philosophy of life was only naked skepticism. Thus the homelessness of modern man speaks movingly also from his writings.

Houston Stewart Chamberlain, whose favorite writers were Montaigne, Rousseau, Voltaire, and Pascal (Pensées), is that personality to whom the National Socialist movement owes the greatest part of its intellectual foundations. Thus writes Rosenberg in 1927 in his "Myth of the Twentieth Century": "When the German people have finally gotten through the swamp of today and set about finally building themselves a German Reich, then they will find that Chamberlain also supplied the foundations for it... He is one of the greatest mediators between the German people and their immortal soul." But Rosenberg's judgment in his writing "Chamberlain as Herald and Founder of a German Future" is not justified when he calls him the most universal man around 1900. Chamberlain, the son of an old English family of which one branch pointed toward Lübeck, found the way via Wagner, Gobineau, and Kant into a

peculiar worldview in which Christianity is rejected even in the form of Protestantism and the Germanic peoples are praised as creators and shapers of a new world. The entire content of his "Foundations of the Nineteenth Century," which appeared in 1899, is the awakening of a most genuinely racially appropriate Nordic feeling for life, which is also the goal of the eternal German struggle of longing from Martin Luther to Goethe and Kant. The Aryan-Nordic race is everywhere placed by him in the foreground of his consideration of philosophy, religion, and culture. Thus his doctrine borrowed from the French of the differential valuation of races forms the foundation of his worldview, in which there is no longer room for Christianity. During the war years a passionate supporter of German policy, since 1921 he was bound by a close friendship with Adolf Hitler, on whose world of ideas he doubtless sought partially to exert an influence, as the book "My Struggle" proves in numerous passages. Chamberlain's worldview was so strongly ethnically-racially determined that even in the World War he saw only the outbreak of an intellectual world struggle that in the twelfth century with the attack of the "pure North" against the world power of Roman-liberal Judaism had appeared for the first time. Just as passionate as his position for Germany was his hatred against everything ecclesiastical and confessional. The dominating ideas of Chamberlain's worldview are: race and ethnic identity, which are intensified to radical demands toward Judaism and Christianity in order to form the new German human type. Racial doctrine assumes a central position in the "Foundations of the Nineteenth Century."

Richard Wagner is assigned a special role among the pioneers of a worldview formed entirely from national thought. One does not go too far when one asserts that a straight line leads from his world of thought on heroic conception of life and influence of race on culture and religion into that of Rosenberg.

As much as Wagner in his stage works repeatedly draws on Christian heritage, as a person he consciously wants to exclude everything ecclesiastical-confessional, as his writing "Religion and Art" sufficiently proves. Contradictory statements about Christianity —about its sublimity and greatness on the one hand and about its "decomposition" through Jewish influence on the other—alternate with one another in his writings. If it would be mistaken to count him among the freethinkers, it nevertheless cannot be denied that in his religious conceptions he stood completely under the influence of Renan, David Strauss, Gobineau, Nietzsche, and liberal Protestant theology. Even if he later mitigated the fanatical hatred of Christianity of his youth under Schopenhauer's influence, still for him Christian religion is only a side-branch of Brahmanism and Buddhism. Thus in him arose a completely falsified image of Christian religion, which had been completely corrupted by Jewish influence and should not be brought into connection with the Old Testament. The latter has no value; it is rather the most terrible confusion of history to bring Christ into connection with Yahweh.

Rarely has an artist so much shaped his works from the ideas of a specific philosophy as Wagner and so intensively and frequently also intervened literarily in worldview struggles and in the whole broad space of cultural philosophy. Even the Kantian Friedrich von Schiller and the Hegelian Hebbel cannot match Wagner in this respect. One must distinguish two periods of Wagner's intellectual life: the first, revolutionary, stands under the influence of the Young Hegelian Feuerbach; the later, calmed, stood fully and completely under the spell of Schopenhauer. And precisely because Wagner became the artistic herald of Schopenhauer, he is the towering musical and dramatic summit of German national idealism. We experience the rare spectacle that a philosophical intellectual current that runs from Kant through Hegel, Fichte, and Schelling and ends

with Schopenhauer gains its ultimate boundaries through a composer. Wagner elevates the German treasure of sagas and zealously advocates for a purely German art.

With Feuerbach he fights against every religion and all dogmas. Dissolution of the individual in universality, sacrifice of the individual person for all humanity (heroic conduct of life). Intoxicated by these ideas, he drafts the plan for a drama: "Jesus of Nazareth," where Christ, stripped of all supernatural character, appears only as a spiritual revolutionary and wants to bring great love into humanity through the sacrifice of his life. The work remained a torso, but the ideas recur in various of his works and they condense, since Wagner read Gobineau's work on the races, into a biological worldview in which all intellectual life is explained from the blood values of race and Judaism as the racially alien race is completely rejected.

Spengler. The worldview of Oswald Spengler, which generates a strong fatalism and in which the proletarian upheaval from within and the revolution of the colored world from without are depicted as compelling developmental necessities of the coming decades, is admittedly rejected by the leadership strata of the Hitler Youth, especially insofar as it was laid down in the writing "Years of Decision." Spengler is regarded by the fighters who brought about the national upheaval in Germany as a representative of the liberal nineteenth century, who is only a scholar and had to weaken the German will to fight with his fatalistic historical constructions; notwithstanding this, it cannot be denied that from his materialistic conceptions of history many stimulations have seeped into the National Socialist world of thought of individual representatives.

Under the influence of these personalities, a shift and reinterpretation of concepts and words has taken place that has penetrated so strongly into the worldview of National Socialism that

it appears questionable to speak of a distinctive philosophy of National Socialism. Each of the named writers has contributed building blocks, without one being able, however, to bring everything to a common denominator or into a closed system. Certain main lines can be discerned and also established in all of them. Perhaps one can characterize the same especially in Dilthey, Scheler, Spengler, and Nietzsche with the following words:

Organic thinking against mechanical, spontaneous becoming against causal, intuition and imagination against strictly logical, systematic thinking, dynamics in place of so-called statics. Especially characteristic of all is the feeling one's way into the rhythm of life, a listening to the mysterious ringing of blood in the stream of peoples and races, a hearkening to myths as the finest flower of the life of peoples. In the final analysis, however, everything flows into a pantheism that Schopenhauer admittedly called the polite form of atheism. Man and God blur without sharp delineating contours into a great intoxication of life, but thereby moral forms and an ultimate responsibility for human action also evaporate.

2. HISTORICAL PREPARATORY WORKS.

The philosophical background of awakening German historicism, in which the forces of ethnic identity, politics, and social theory obtain a determining influence on historiography, is formed by Hegel, the father of dialectics and simultaneously of two hostile brothers, nationalism and Marxism. The question of good and evil is no longer exhausted in his philosophy in historical factuality, but according to other values. From the school of this militant patriotism and the Prussian conception of history, which were born after earlier beginnings in the revolutionary year 1848, emerged a series of significant scholars (Häuser, von Sybel, Treitschke, Mommsen,

Droysen). This form of historical science became one of the principal forces that created national Germany. It was the breakthrough of the political spirit, of the Prussian idea of state into historiography.

According to this, the course of world history does not stand outside virtue, as Hegel believed; world history is also not purely immanently the world judgment in Schiller's sense, but rather the living and stronger person is right (von Sybel). Success provides the moral justification of a political action. In the assessment of people and things, politics and nationality therefore precede ethics and dogma. A new vision of life begins. From the political creative will a new historiography is also born. No longer the question of how it happened (Ranke), nor the quiet self-reflection of Romanticism (Herder, Johannes von Müller) determines this historical school, but rather the becoming conscious of one's own national standpoint toward history (circle around Stefan George, Ernst Bertram). Man is nothing outside his people and their history. This belief in the eternal unity of German occurrence now dominates historical representation. Its object becomes the people and not statehood, which was often given only through dynastic interests. It would be unjust, however, simply to equate Hegel's state philosophy, in which the concepts of nation, ethnic identity, and race were only secondary, with National Socialism. If for Hegel the state is the "absolute end in itself," then in National Socialism the state signifies only a means to an end.

Here three ideas meet in National Socialist writing when one surveys German historical research of the nineteenth century:

a) The opposition between Little German and Greater German historical representation. Heinrich von Treitschke is regarded as the classical representative of the former, in whose works Protestant Prussia appears played off against Catholic Austria and Frederick II against Maria Theresa. Treitschke's intellectual posture

substantially influenced the ex-Jesuit Count Paul von Hoensbroech and pressed him into an anti-Roman conviction. For him too, papal Rome is the hereditary enemy of Germany. Treitschke and Hoensbroech in turn worked further on Rosenberg, who represents the same conceptions in various passages. The Reich Office for the Promotion of German Literature has included in its published list of the hundred most important books for National Socialist libraries "Treitschke, German History." With this, Treitschke is received into the ranks of the men whom national Germany acknowledges as its models and leaders.

b) The dispute over the actual significance of the Roman Empire of the German Nation for the history of the German people.

c) The repeated attempts at founding a German national church, whereby strong character and intellectual differences between the Germanic and Romance peoples play a role. It must not be overlooked that in these national church endeavors of the past, strong communist and social motives repeatedly intervene, against which Luther already had to take a position.

3. POETS & CULTURAL PHILOSOPHERS AS NATIONAL CHAMPIONS.

In Austria: Anastasius Grün (statesman Count Auersperg), Anzengruber, Rosegger, partially Schaukal, who however were unfortunately strongly dominated by liberalism and Kulturkampf mentality and underestimated Rome's religious significance for Germandom. No one disputes their partially outstanding literary talent, which even deceived Catholics about how much the poison of religious indifference penetrated the people from these poets. They quietly continued religious dismantling while the Austrian

government had long since called off the Kulturkampf of the seventies.

In Bavaria: Thoma, Felix Dahn, the circle around the Lower Saxon Wilhelm Busch, from whose works one learns to better understand many slogans and peculiar religious conceptions of leading writers of our day. Adolf Bartels cannot be passed over here. To be named further are the masters of folkish poetry (Stehr, Ernst, Strauß, Grimm, Carossa) and the poets of the war generation (Walter Flex).

Above all, however, it is the circle around Stefan George, the classical poet of the movement, "the voice of the nation for post-war Germany," who made the "masculine" life-form of Christianity—fellowship, friendship, and comradeship in struggle—the basic posture, but was religiously completely disintegrated. His writings are the consistent expression of the secularized man of the nineteenth century.

Special significance was attained by Moeller van den Bruck (died 1925), Dietrich Eckart, the poet of the song "Storm" with the refrain "Germany awake!", and Hermann Löns (died 1914 as a war volunteer at Loivre on the Western Front).

Eckart, a self-willed, self-confident, almost peculiar personality to be called, was the first poet who found the way to Adolf Hitler. His creative work was determined by Peer Gynt. Regarding the Jewish question and the political power standpoint, he wandered on the generally known paths.

Arthur Moeller van den Bruck, who received the experience of Germans abroad in the Baltic region and in Scandinavia, became in Berlin editor of the journal "The Conscience," the intellectual leader of the June Club, and influenced the University Circle. He is regarded as the political instructor of young Germany through his theses on the "Right of the Young" and "Socialist Foreign Policy."

Through his numerous works he pointed the way directionally to the future for the young generation of the first post-war years. Thus he became the instructor of an entire political leadership stratum. Besides Treitschke, no other writer can describe the epitome of the word "Prussianism" so impressively and propagandistically. For him too, only an anti-liberal-heroic life ideal hovers before him when he writes in his book "The Political Man":

"Our mission is: not to let the world come to rest. Our destiny is: to be a scandal of the spirit to the peoples of comfortable living when we, whom it was suggested to annihilate ourselves, accomplish our political rebirth."

Religiously he too was completely disintegrated, so he voluntarily departed from life when after the acceptance of the Dawes Plan the further future of Germany appeared to him almost hopeless. The political and cultural content of his life's work justifies A. Hohlfeldt in the following prediction:

"That in the historical achievement of Adolf Hitler the political testament of Moeller van den Bruck becomes reality, that is the meaning of the time and the task that the next century of German history places before its people."

Common to all is the rejection of Christianity and the cult of the heroic man. Entirely different paths were walked by the Holsteiner Julius Langbehn, the "Rembrandt German," whose thought-laden book "Rembrandt as Educator" in 1890 with its ideas on leadership, heroic education, race, peasantry, and national community found enthusiastic reception, just as the work "Spirit of the Whole" (1930) published from his estate by his follower Momme Nissen. Doubtless Langbehn too, whose correspondence with Paul de Lagarde was published in the May 1934 issue of "Deutsche Rundschau," Bibliographical Institute, Leipzig, was a fighter for the rebirth of a true German national community, with a strong

antipathy against the predominance of Jews, but without treading Lagarde's religious false paths. He rather found peace in the Catholic Church, without therefore having to give up anything of his ethnic conviction.

At this point must also be named the national aesthete, cultural philosopher, Protestant theology professor, and biblical critic Anton de Lagarde (died 1891), who earlier bore the less appealing name Böttcher. He stood under the influence of Ewald in Göttingen and Fr. Rückert, from whom he inherited an unclear, dogma-less piety. His significance lies, besides in his scholarly specialty of Oriental studies, in the intellectual foundation of the German movement, which, coming since the mid-eighteenth century through German idealism, Romantic poetry, and national unification in the wars of liberation, around the turn of the century produced a new wave of great renewal movements (youth movement, popular education, the Rembrandt German). But for Lagarde alone, national-political work was the expression of a religious-worldview basic posture, which in turn was cause and effect of his theological thinking. For him theology was only historical science (comparative history of religions), pathfinder of a new German religion, and indeed he strove for a German Christianity with an old Germanic pagan element. He regarded as principal opponents of his world of thought Paul (Fichte and Renan judged likewise), Augustine, and Luther. Although he denied antisemitism constructed on the racial principle and did not want to be a radical antisemite, he rejected Judaism. An abundance of stimulations lies in his "German Writings," in which he regards himself as the herald and prophet of a new Germany to whom contemporaries refused recognition. Characteristic for Lagarde are the following thoughts, which were taken over almost verbatim by Chamberlain and Rosenberg: "The concept of God in Christianity is false. Religion is personal

relationship to God." "Paul brought the Old Testament into the Church, by whose influence the Gospel, insofar as this was possible, has perished." "Nations are thoughts of God." "Catholicism, Protestantism, Judaism, naturalism must vacate the field before a new worldview, so that they are no more remembered than the night lamp is remembered when the morning sun shines over the mountains— or else the unity of Germany becomes more questionable from day to day." "The new German Christianity must be church-free." It is characteristic that Hanns Johst too, the apologist of the ethnic idea (compare his Luther drama "The Prophets"), and Kolbenheyer repeat ideas of the preceding pioneers.

4. SOCIAL PREPARATORY WORKS.

As will be explained in more detail below, precisely in this area the religiously conviction-faithful Catholic and Protestant German can go along with the social demands of National Socialism for considerable stretches without coming into conflict with his conscience. In various matters we find great agreement with the social encyclicals of recent popes. The main programmatic points of National Socialism are: land reform (new law for land ownership and inheritance, promotion of valuable hereditary lines, permanence of landed property), elevation of agriculture through expansion of agricultural cooperatives, rejection of over-industrialization, debt relief for the peasant class and introduction of agricultural labor law, struggle against capitalism and trust formation, pushing back of trade unions built on class struggle through a new organization in which industrial capital and labor power should approach one another, nationalization of major banks, elimination of debt slavery, cashless payment transactions, loosening of private property in relation to the national community in contrast to the exaggeration of

this concept in Roman private law, development of the estate idea and a sound middle-class policy, struggle against women's labor and the modern women's movement in order to revive the value of family and mother, rejection of birth control, elimination of housing shortage, abolition of department stores and consumer cooperatives as harmful to the middle class, old-age security, compulsory labor service (settlement system). Individual program parts of National Socialism admittedly belong more to the realm of pious wishes, such as the autarky of the economy, the detachment of currency from gold, the abolition of taxes, and the abolition of taking interest. On the latter question, the Catholic Church too, despite the vehement controversies of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, has taken only an indirect position in several decisions of the Penitentiary, without wanting to solve the problem itself. These decisions of the Holy Penitentiary give the instruction: silence must be kept—an indication that a practical solution was simply not possible. National Socialism has therefore itself dismantled much precisely regarding these social program points under the pressure of the world economy, because the economic interests of peoples and states in modern life are too strongly interwoven with one another to be able to solve such momentous problems unilaterally. Therefore one also cannot assert of any political party in the past, whether interconfessional or confessionally bound, that it always pursued an uncompromising path in the social sphere. Whoever examines the National Socialist economic program more precisely will moreover be able to establish the gratifying fact that the entire material that was processed in the articles of the party program had already long previously been put forward as demands by the leading writers of the Austrian Christian Social Party, the Catholic workers' movement in Germany (Bishop von Ketteler), the school of München-Gladbach (Hitze), and the circles around Baron Vogelsang, the classic of these

Christian-social reform efforts and especially of the estate state idea, further by the Christian-social movement founded in Berlin by the court preacher Adolf Stoecker. Even with the social encyclicals of the popes Leo XIII and Pius XI extensive agreements are found. Precisely in the social sphere, German Catholicism in the Reich and in Austria (Lueger) accomplished exemplary work and already submitted proposals decades before the founding of National Socialism was even discussed, which today could not be better formulated by the latter. When once in quiet times the history of the social struggles of the nineteenth century is written, the fact will no longer be disputable by anyone that National Socialism could take over valuable elements of its social demands from the named political directions and personalities. The principal questions: land reform, protective tariffs, prohibition of interest, capitalism, estate state, collectivist forms of property constitute in Catholic literature the constantly recurring problems of the social struggles of the nineteenth century, whereby admittedly the conviction always predominates again and again that more important than the best programmatic demands would be the formation of a new ethical economic conviction and a religious sense of duty deepened toward one's fellow man. For the rest, however unclear the idea of the corporately organized state structure and the intended combination of state economic direction and private entrepreneurship still is in Germany, whose study has not progressed beyond the first beginnings, it shows some kinship with the reconstruction of the state begun by Fascism and influenced by Spann's ideas. The question of the correct economic form of the modern state has simply become the fundamental problem of all states, even if the means and methods will be nationally conditioned and will have effect only for a specific partial area under special historical and economic circumstances. Also in Germany the ultimate goal will be

the same as in the social program of Action Française and that of Fascist Italy: to let no economic partial area escape the influence-taking of the state, beginning with the population question up to that of the market and foreign trade relations. National Socialism contains not only conservative but equally revolutionary components and must, if it does not want to end as romanticism or wishful thinking, extend the totalitarian compulsion to system to social life. Thus it reaches far beyond the social demands of its predecessors. It is essentially also socialism, and indeed of German character. Therefore it will, corresponding to the demand of the power state, attempt to eliminate every danger of the division or decomposition of the people's power, of social discord and class struggle, as has already been begun in Italy through Fascist labor legislation, the law on trade unions of April 3, 1926, the labor constitution of the "Carta del Lavoro" of April 21, 1927, and the founding of the corporations. The social conception manifested therein bears an unmistakably military stamp; the principle of duty prevails, not that of individual or collective right. Moreover, the Fascist economic system combines private economy with state economy and thereby prevents strikes and lockouts as well as the predominance of private interest over the interest of the community. Fascism, which wants to displace the planned economy of the Soviet system through the corporate state ("The Fascist state is corporate or it is not"), is however also simpler and more indirect in these economic and population-political questions, whereas National Socialism burdens these endeavors too heavily with other problems.

III. THE RELIGIOUS, MORAL, AND HISTORICO-PHILOSOPHICAL DOCTRINES OF NATIONAL SOCIALISM.

1. THE CONCEPT OF WORLDVIEW.

No concept has been used in all its variants and gradations as frequently in recent decades as that of worldview. It has become a catchword behind which much or nothing is often concealed. All the more dangerous, however, is this word, which cannot be translated adequately into other languages but can only be made comprehensible through paraphrases, because many apply this concept to domains of life of relative significance.

What is worldview? Worldview is not synonymous with world picture. Goethe does not yet use this word, which appears for the first time in Schelling in 1799, although his contemporary Alexander von Humboldt wrote a history of worldviews. Humboldt understands by this those conceptions that man has formed over time of the inhabited parts of the earth. Hegel and Schelling, however, understand by it only that sum of thoughts which one forms about the world in the sense of the universe, in order to understand the origin and course of the world.

How do the two concepts religion and worldview relate to each other, which are regarded by some National Socialist circles as opposites or essentially different concepts? The Christian religion as revelation is not a view in the proper sense, and when it proclaims the origin, course, and passing of the world, it does not intend to convey to us a worldview in the physical sense. Therefore one cannot simply equate the concepts worldview and religion, for there exists a worldview that excludes religion from the outset altogether, namely worldview materialism.

Socialism too has adopted the word worldview, although this doctrine, which in its system intended only to provide a reorganization of human society, contains nothing directly about the origin of the cosmos. Thus there soon arose, because the concept became ever more diffuse, a liberal-bourgeois, conservative-democratic, socialist-proletarian, and free-religious worldview. To obtain clarity, one would have to separate above all philosophy and political worldview from each other, although the latter is in many respects precisely connected with the former and receives from it its intellectual guidelines.

Does there therefore exist a worldview of National Socialism in the philosophical sense, as the Greifswald University Professor Hermann Schwarz, the founder of the philosophy of the "ungiven," attempts when he explains everything, state and intellectual life, from the religious? The party program itself avoids such conceptual formation and takes Christianity as something given with which one must reckon politically, just as with its division into various confessions, without passing judgment on the correctness of this Christian religion and the various confessional splinterings. Thus initially more worldview in the political sense would be meant if one takes the program of the party as such, whereas in the leading literature this concept worldview appears taken in the philosophical

religious cultural sense, so that contradictions, conflicts of conscience, and tensions must necessarily result for anyone who thinks more deeply about this question.

An example of this conceptual confusion is given by Otto Bangert, "German Revolution," Munich, Franz Eher Verlag, 1931/32, pp. 77-93:

"When National Socialism was accused of not possessing or being a worldview, this is primarily because the National Socialist worldview cannot be grasped purely intellectually, but just as it sprang from the blood, it also wants to be understood from the blood. National Socialism as worldview cannot be taught, but must be experienced!"

Rosenberg in particular has interpreted the concept of worldview in multiple ways. Compare the following passages!

In the speech that Alfred Rosenberg delivered on February 22, 1934, before leading men of the state and the party, also representatives of the religions (according to the "Völkischer Beobachter"):

"In the domain of philosophy and religious life, profound struggles and upheavals are currently taking place. Here the position of our movement has been unambiguous from the first day, and this position once adopted will not be changed by the NSDAP as party and also as state.... Your leader has therefore taken the position as a true statesman and man of the people that the great combat movement should keep away from the individual differences of opinion in religious life. The NSDAP has always declared that it recognizes every genuine religious confession that does not contradict Germanic values and is willing to protect it."

"We respect the faith of the state-recognized churches, but also every striving that seeks new religious forms. We do not know whether the efforts toward a German national church will be

successful or not; we comprehend and respect it when the rejection of these reform attempts is clearly expressed by the other confessions, but we do not claim the right, either as movement or as state, to present the leaders of this movement as immature hotheads."

"We must grant every National Socialist as a personality the right to take a position on the individual questions of our time as his conscience commands him."

"When we in the brown shirt want to be nothing but Germans, we will forbid the brown shirt to anyone of us who engages in religious questions or debates. No National Socialist is permitted to conduct public religious discussions in the uniform of his movement. The National Socialist Party has not fought for religious dogmas and will not fight for them."

"Every worldview is exactly as strong as the will of its bearers to defend it."

Standing in complete contradiction to this, the essay "The Struggle for Intellectual and Cultural Formation" published by Alfred Rosenberg in the "Völkischer Beobachter" at year's end 1934 (issue of December 31) states:

"The National Socialist revolution has received its meaning through worldview and sacrifice; it cannot renounce its worldview and content itself only with state policy, but state policy here is the internal political security for the development of National Socialist core ideas. The unity of worldview, people, and state is the unalterable goal of the National Socialist movement, yesterday, today, and tomorrow."

Likewise in the lecture of January 17, 1935, in Berlin:

"German National Socialism, the worldview founded on blood and soil, is not a universalistic dogma, that is, it claims neither in its asserted presuppositions nor in its conclusions to want to influence peoples and races of different nature. It believes, however,

that with its confession it returns to a reverent admiration of nature and its laws.

The National Socialist worldview therefore appears to us as a conscious turning away from those forms of life that did not take into account the nature of the various peoples and races, as a rejection of cultural-scientific doctrines striving for universal validity, and as the attempt at a heightened and simultaneously deepened self-awareness of one's own driving forces in precisely these domains."

The continual change of concepts with words remaining the same necessarily causes dangers in National Socialism as soon as one elevates it beyond the purely political in opposition to its program. Whoever therefore speaks of philosophical foundations of National Socialism already sees in it more than a political system. For him National Socialism is worldview in the most authentic sense. Thus the efforts of Otto Dietrich and Walter Frank must also be understood. Both, however, cease with their worldview-philosophical interpretation of National Socialism where the true problems and philosophical work first begin. Dietrich believes that the intellectual world picture of most philosophies of the past is individualism, while community-conscious thinking represents the particular National Socialist innovation in German philosophy. Community-conscious thinking, combined with racial biological thinking, is the only real sphere of human life on this earth. This presentation, however, is no less an extreme than the former individualism, which saw the value and meaning of life only in the individual and allowed the community, the state, to be justified only from its service function to and for the individual.

If on the other hand Dietrich believes that man as an individual personality has no freedom at all, since he is in all actions a collective human being, then Hegel speaks through him, for whom the state alone is the concrete freedom and the community nothing

other than the acceptance of the bonds of the community. However severely Dietrich struggles with the problem to save the values of personality within this collectivism, the foundations of his philosophy are only race, people, and nation. "The actual givens that we find in the world are not individual human beings, but races, peoples, and nations." The foundation of a National Socialist philosophy appears to me even less clear in Frank.

Fundamental Principles:

1. A true worldview must aim at the whole and instead of analysis, fragmentation, and juxtaposition provide synthesis, totality, and hierarchy, in order to meet every danger of one-sidedness and narrowing.

2. Christianity is directed at the whole, as the name Catholic already indicates. Beside this religion there can therefore also be no actual worldview in the philosophical-cultural sense, except as a substitute for a lost Christianity.

3. Every worldview in the proper sense strives toward totality of life. Therefore only he has a true worldview who answers the ultimate questions of human existence regarding the origin and goal of life in a unified manner and also thinks through and lives through this answer to its ultimate conclusions.

4. According to Christian teaching, a genuine worldview can only be gained from religion; it must therefore encompass the universe and God. It may not stop at people and state or even at internal politics. The Christian says: I can die for people and state, but I may not make both into religion by way of a new worldview. I can confess to German nationhood and to a social ethic on the basis of a fervent love for soil and people, but I cannot put nationalism and socialism as worldview in the original conceptual interpretation in the place of belief in God.

5. Viewed from a Christian perspective and also from the standpoint of prudent state policy, it would therefore be more correct to speak in National Socialism only of a political world picture and not of a worldview, since the latter concept already contains more and encroaches upon the religious. A political world picture, on the other hand, does not necessarily presuppose any particular religious bond; in other words, just as the secularization of religion must also be avoided by way of conceptual unclarity, so too must a religionization of National Socialism be avoided. Both would make the internal unity of the people more difficult and would also completely contradict the program of National Socialism. The co-founder and pioneer of the student labor service, who has been formed in the forge of life into a convinced National Socialist, the Protestant theology professor Caius Fabricius, has in his most recent writing thoughts that coincide completely with the preceding explanations over wide stretches.

2. POSITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

Among the unshakeable programmatic points of National Socialism belongs the confession to positive Christianity. However this concept may be interpreted, it means Christianity and not paganism. It is at the same time the recognition of the Christian past of the German people and the opposition to Bolshevik godless propaganda. Several questions arise immediately when one examines this concept more closely, which is not a National Socialist innovation but already appears earlier in theological scholarship.

Is it synonymous with a practically practiced believing Christianity? Should it reject the Christianity taught by liberal representatives of Protestant theology in the nineteenth century, in which ecclesiastically positive and ecclesiastically liberal were

opposed to each other? Does this Christianity signify a natural heroic life ideal with the rejection of the Christian teaching of humility, love, and sin? Is it a Christianity without dogma or only the Old Germanic interpretation of Christianity emphasizing more the heroic in the "Heliand"? A dogmaless Christianity, however, can scarcely be understood in this formulation of Article 24, for without dogma there is no concrete community, no Christianity, and also no political party. No one has recognized this more clearly than Hitler when he says in his confessional writing (p. 293) that "without the dogmatic foundations of the individual churches the practical existence of a religious faith is not conceivable." "The attack on the dogmas as such therefore also greatly resembles the struggle against the general legal foundations of the state, and just as the latter" (that is the struggle against the state) "would find its end in complete state anarchy, so the other" (that is the attack on the dogmas) "in a worthless religious nihilism."

The concept of "positive Christianity" is established in Article 24 of the party program, which makes a restriction with regard to Germanic moral sensibility; however, these words need not necessarily be related to the positive Christianity mentioned in what follows, according to the entire context. Added to this are the statements of various authorized leaders who elucidate the concept.

Article 24 of the program of the National Socialist German Workers' Party reads:

"We demand freedom for all religious confessions in the state, insofar as they do not endanger its existence or offend against the morality and moral sense of the Germanic race.

The party as such represents the standpoint of a positive Christianity, without binding itself confessionally to any particular confession. It combats the Jewish-materialistic spirit within and outside us and is convinced that a lasting recovery of our people can

only occur from within on the foundation: common good before individual good."

Gottfried Feder gives the following commentary on Article 24 of the program:

"The culture of the Middle Ages stood under the sign of the cross; great deeds, willingness to sacrifice, courageous faith found its root in Christianity. There one must distinguish well and carefully between the inner, spiritual core of Christianity and the manifold excrescences of its worldly form of appearance. Certainly the German people will also one day find a form for its God-recognition, its God-life, as its Nordic blood component demands, certainly only then will the trinity of blood, faith, and state be complete. Of greatest significance in this domain too will prove the becoming conscious of the Nordic thought. But these are all thoughts of secular significance that also go beyond the framework of so fundamentally revolutionary a program as National Socialism proclaims."

Hitler himself, as the solely authorized interpreter of the program, expresses himself at several places in his book "Mein Kampf":

"The movement sees in both religious confessions equally valuable supports for the existence of our people." (p. 379.) "Religious teachings and institutions of his people must always be inviolable to the political leader; otherwise he may not be a politician but should become a reformer if he has the stuff for it." (p. 127.) "Even if there were still ever so much to be found fault with in the individual confession, the political party may not for a moment lose sight of the fact that according to all previous experience of history, a purely political party has never yet succeeded in similar situations in achieving a religious reformation." (p. 128.)

Positive Christianity according to these clear words of the leader is above all Christianity as it is; more precisely formulated,

since the program is primarily intended for the German Reich, it is Christianity as it exists in the German Reich. Christianity in the German Reich, however, is split into a series of confessions. This is not an ideal condition; but it is positively given and in any case not to be changed in the foreseeable future. By declaring that the party represents the standpoint of positive Christianity, it establishes this to mean that it, having come to power, will accept this condition and will fundamentally refrain from any attempt to change it through state measures. That this is the meaning of the program also follows from the annotations to it, which have been expressly approved by the leader of the party. They read on this point:

"All questions, hopes, and wishes whether the German people will one day find a new form for its God-recognition and its God-life do not belong here; these are things of secular significance that also go far beyond the framework of so fundamentally revolutionary a program as National Socialism proclaims."

The formulation of this passage read until the year 1931:

"Certainly the German people will also one day find a form for its God-recognition, its God-life, as its Nordic blood component demands, certainly only then will the trinity of blood, faith, and state be complete. Of greatest significance will prove also in this domain the becoming conscious of the Nordic thought. But these are things of secular significance that also go beyond the framework of so fundamentally revolutionary a program as National Socialism proclaims."

The proclamation of the Reich government to the German people of February 1, 1933, on the other hand, contains a very clear position:

"The national government will preserve and defend the foundations on which the strength of our nation rests. It will take

Christianity as the basis of our entire morality, the family as the germ cell of our people and state organism under firm protection."

On March 23, 1933, the Reich Chancellor was even clearer in his great programmatic speech before the Reichstag:

"The national government sees in the two Christian confessions the most important factors for the preservation of our nationhood. It will respect the treaties concluded between them and the states. Their rights shall not be infringed... It will face all confessions in objective justice... The government's concern is the sincere coexistence between Church and state. The struggle against a materialistic worldview, for a true national community, serves the interests of German religion as well as the welfare of our Christian faith."

The leadership organ of the National Socialist youth movement "Wille und Macht" of April 15, 1935, on the other hand, defines this concept much more narrowly in an article "Positive Christianity":

"National Socialism affirms Christianity—whether it appears as church or as faith, in the political or in the religious realm —not simply; it affirms it only when it is positive, when it maintains the boundaries within itself and toward political power as has been shown.

What is political? Political is everything that appears in the earthly forms of organization, of word and image, of writing and gesture and has even the slightest significance for the community of the people.

And what is religious? Religious is everything that becomes perceptible in earthly not graspable forms as faith in the supernatural, as feeling of infinity, as longing for things beyond the world visible to men."

According to this interpretation, which by no means agrees with the program of National Socialism, the "positive Christianity" of National Socialism would be a religion that, detached from tradition and dogmatic bond, takes only the human personality of Christ and this only insofar as it proclaims "heroic" values, as its center. In this sense the concept of positive Christianity was also understood at the beginning of the movement by Protestant, Christ-believing circles, especially by Stapel, whose journal "Deutsches Volkstum" and whose works are of deep effect for National Socialism:

"We assert that the conception of morality as a universal law with systematic virtue and vice order is itself racially conditioned. It is the Romance, Mediterranean conception. In contrast, the understanding of morality as an immediate vitality of feeling is specifically Germanic in kind. The German does not ask the priest as the possessor of a higher moral knowledge, but his own heart. This is called 'inwardness.'

In the struggle over Point 24, therefore, Romance and Germanic conceptions contend over what the Church is, whether it is a moral and thus political power or a pure redemptive power."

Alfred Rosenberg also stands in opposition to the official declarations of Article 24 cited first, who in his theological thoughts is influenced by Wellhausen, Stade, Harnack, and Nietzsche. His position in National Socialism, however, is so significant that even as a private person he cannot undertake anything against this article if he does not want to be a false herald of the party. Thus a contradiction arises when Rosenberg in the introduction to the "Myth of the Twentieth Century" (p. 2) believes that the thoughts presented there by him are thoroughly personal confessions and not program points of the political movement to which he belongs. While he on the one hand in the "Myth" (p. 14) absolutely rejects

being the founder of a new religion, he proclaims there a worldview system with many details that one must designate as religion or religion substitute. Precisely from his words speaks again and again the assertion of a distinctive Germanic law and moral sensibility, because through the Christian teaching of humility the Germanic character has been warped. The following words are not ambiguous ("Myth," p. 595):

"The precondition of all German education is the recognition of the fact that Christianity did not bring us civilization, but that Christianity owes its enduring values to Germanic character... The Germanic character values are therefore the eternal, to which everything else must adjust itself. Whoever does not want this renounces a German rebirth and also pronounces his own spiritual death sentence. A man or a movement that wants to help these values to complete victory has the moral right not to spare what opposes them. They have the duty to overcome it spiritually, to let it wither organizationally, and to keep it politically powerless. If however a will to culture does not become a power enterprise, it should not begin any struggle at all."

We find this view almost verbatim in Lagarde, furthermore repeatedly in the Gospel criticism of Protestant historical theology. It has grown precisely on that soil from which liberal theology sprang with Traub, Jatho, etc. On many Protestant chairs and pulpits of Germany such and similar views were presented long before the World War.

In general one can observe that today the teachings of the liberal theology of Protestantism in Germany take effect just as once the Enlightenment philosophy of Diderot and d'Alembert, which first gripped only the educated circles of France but then after several decades descended into the people and later experienced its tragic realization and tragedy in the bloodbath of the French Revolution.

Thus there is a world judgment that is immanent to the development of history. Perhaps one can apply the word of the Bible: "The sons shall atone for the sins of their fathers."

The names Renan, Strauss, Feuerbach, Harnack ring again and again through these modern interpretation attempts of the concept "positive Christianity." After decades of constant demolition of the substance of Christianity in German Protestantism, today the confrontation concerns the last meager remains of a religious world uprooted in wide circles. It must not be overlooked, however, that these conceptual interpretations absolutely contradict the party program and also the classical confessional words of Adolf Hitler.

According to Rosenberg, who wants to extract from the life picture of Christ only the "active" traits most corresponding to the Nordic soul, the marks of positive Christianity ("Myth," p. 202) are honor, freedom, and duty, furthermore a religious subjectivism that passionately resists any dogmatic and ecclesiastical bond. As little tangible as we learn about positive Christianity from Rosenberg, so much unambiguous do we take from his explanations about "negative" Christianity ("Myth," p. 77), which according to him took its departure mainly from the suffering of Christ and is characterized by priestly rule on the basis of Syrian Etruscan traditions. According to Rosenberg, so-called positive Christianity would be nothing but a religiously disguised blood myth, a Christian-shimmering racial faith, a subjective religious feeling that stands in mortal enmity to dogma-supported church faith.

While Rosenberg sees in Christianity a sinking worldview, something dying that one must not push, however, in order to avoid internal political difficulties, Hitler at the party congress in Nuremberg 1935 passed a much more objective judgment and acknowledged the merits of the Christian religion for the unification of the tribes in the past.

Many questions of a fundamental nature, which belong to the domain of comparative religious studies, dogma, and history, would have to be treated here in order to establish with complete clarity that Rosenberg's interpretation of "positive Christianity" cannot possibly coincide with that of the program and Hitler. A large part of the uncertainty with which Rosenberg and many non-Catholic circles approach this complex of questions probably also has its cause in the fact that they see Christianity too much in the spotlight of Roman culture, as if Christianity and Roman culture were two coinciding concepts. On the other hand, precisely the various interpretations of the concept "positive Christianity" demonstrate how elastic it is in a political program that naturally knows no dogmatic and philosophical delimitations but only practical life and consideration for party political advantages. If one wanted to penetrate more deeply into this entire domain, how difficult it would be to determine alone what Germanic ethics and German piety actually contain! Is Christianity not congenial to Germanic character? Has it led to a destruction or enhancement of Germanic religious thinking? Whoever compares the God-inwardness of German mysticism with that of other peoples will hardly be able to speak of essential differences. However, the thought world of Nietzsche, which breaks forth like a torrent in so many trains of thought of National Socialism, has destroyed for an entire generation the nimbus of Christianity and developed oppositions that will long continue to resonate in the German soul. It is shattering to follow the effect of this one-sided National Socialist interpretation of positive Christianity in the contemporary literature that wrongly appeals to Adolf Hitler's book "Mein Kampf," p. 445.

Thus in this concept of positive Christianity, which the leading National Socialist literature gives us, lie manifold mysteries that make a unambiguous interpretation difficult. One can see in it

only a general formulation that is practically conditioned by the confessional split of Germany, or a narrowing of the universal character of Christianity, which however, because of divine origin, should not be measured by racial feelings and national cultural circles but should first elevate these out of itself. The latter interpretation of the concept "positive Christianity," which contradicts Hitler's clear words, would indeed end in heresy. Already this manifold interpretation of the two fundamental concepts "worldview," "positive Christianity" by individual writers who enter into conscious opposition to the original program of National Socialism causes an unclarity and insecurity of the entire system in the further conclusions.

3. *THE RACE PROBLEM.*

With this question we touch upon a central point of worldview National Socialism, the fundamental dogma and the leading idea, which through faith in the value of blood and the assumption of various "race souls" is supposed to convey entirely new insights also regarding history, religion, and culture. Soon, according to the judgment of radically oriented circles, there will be not merely an economic and political but also a racial imperialism.

The organ of the Hitler Youth, "Wille und Macht," writes (p. 1, 1933): "We believe that the spirit too is subject to racial supremacy. Race is everything, race is destiny," furthermore on page 8 in an article "Race and Worldview":

"Racial scientific thinking makes no sharp distinction between nature and spirit, but sees both united through what one calls soul. The means of expression of nature are proper to the landscape, the capacities of spirit to man. Thus man and landscape too are not to be strictly separated from each other, but are different

forms of appearance of a unity. This unifying element is race. Between landscape and man stands race, and in it landscape and man are united. With this, however, the soul becomes the means of expression of race, indeed it is itself race. The concept of soul now receives a completely new meaning that it has always lacked hitherto. Soul is race, that is, that which is between nature and spirit, what is simultaneously nature and spirit."

Then in the October issue of 1935: "The discovery of race is the Copernican deed of modern times. The sciences of nature and history, long separated, unite today to draw the consequences of the enormous discovery. When Kepler and Galileo completed the work of Copernicus, they were threatened by the Church. Science has shown us with the humanity of masculine courage where we stand. No masculine spirit has yet become smaller through the gaze into this abyss, but many have become harder and more severe. Science has been on bad terms with the Church since the heroic beginnings of modern natural science. After centuries the Church has finally accommodated itself to the modern natural scientific world picture. It has recognized that it can still exist with the revision of our natural world picture. The Copernican turn in the domain of the historical world picture places the Church in an entirely different danger. This Church is itself a historical formation. Through the discovery of the races and peoples that have shaped it, the fiction of its supernatural unity is destroyed. The Copernican world picture was harmless compared to the new racial world picture of the history of mankind."

Particularly directional are the words of Rosenberg (Party Congress 1933): "We believe that the greatest discovery of our time consists in the experience and in the strictly scientific proof that it is no accident when human beings of different kinds walk upon this globe, when from the conditionedness of these peculiarities different

states, cultures, and forms of life arise, that thus blood and character are only different words for the same essence.

We know that a nation is represented by the predominance of a particular, blood-conditioned character; furthermore through language, through geographical environment, and through a political common sense of destiny. We know, however, that the last-mentioned givens are not the final ones, but that blood, the race dominant within a nation, represents the decisive element."

Furthermore at the Party Congress of 1935 in Nuremberg: "The Party is convinced that racial science will form the foundation for a coming deeper self-awareness of individual peoples about the decisive impulses of their action, about the peculiarity of the soul of nations, and about what really means vital necessity for their culture. Beyond this, this self-knowledge will also promote respect for the peculiarity of other races and will know how to honor every creative indigenous growth. Racial science has become the standard-bearer of a new understanding also of ancient culture and of the tensions within the structure of Western civilization."

How thoroughly this dogma penetrates everywhere is also proven by the following words of Helmut Schubert, editor for press questions in the Race Policy Office of the NSDAP, Berlin:

"The race idea is the foundation of the worldview that was elevated to state idea on January 30, 1933. Through the clean separation of German from foreign-origin hereditary material, the national community shall be established in which all racially kindred forces can become effective unrestricted by foreign influences. The ultimate goal is the equation of national community and blood community. Our worldview declares the purity of race to be the supreme measure of value. We have thereby rediscovered the laws of life according to which a millennia-old Western culture has developed."

In all these utterances, which are particularly influenced by Chamberlain, people, nation, and race appear as synonymous concepts.

The race idea is placed so strongly at the center of the entire National Socialist program by individual representatives that it appears precisely as the fundamental dogma of the whole movement and all legal demands somehow seek their foundation in it. It therefore counts in leading National Socialist literature as a sign of liberalism to deny the influence of race on history, destiny, and culture of peoples and to want to replace it with social and intellectual influences. Every strong emphasis on intellectual forces in the cultural development of peoples is designated as a betrayal of the foundations of the movement. Only blood and race, not however social position or social history and a religious confession, essentially determine peoples and cultures according to this view.

Thus one already speaks of a racial soul science, which Ludwig Ferdinand Clauss claims to have founded as a discipline, after he had recognized in the front experience and in the upheavals of the postwar period the necessity of a national psychology and a revaluation of the German person. Much human observation combines in this race dogma with artistic fantasy and bold intuition, although serious science has by no means yet arrived at unimpeachable final results. Above all, the constancy of intellectual race characteristics has not yet been clarified, the effect of Mendelism on intellectual life, and in general the determination of intellectual racial peculiarities, so that it appears risky to want to explain the cultural rise and decline only from the blood value of race, if one does not want to end in materialism.

The race idea itself is of French origin; as a biological worldview with an anthropocentric world picture, it is a reawakening

of the ideas of Ernst Haeckel, who is justly enrolled in the patristics of National Socialism.

It is a paradoxical fact that two Frenchmen, a nobleman and a bourgeois moyen, Georges Sorel, have formed two concepts that were to receive enormous significance in the intellectual and political confrontation of the immediate present, and that precisely in that land in which through Gobineau ("Essai sur l'inégalité des races humaines," 1854), Taine ("Introduction à l'Histoire de la Littérature anglaise," 1863), and the student of Darwin, Spencer, Galton, and Haeckel, Count Georges Vacher de Lapouge ("Sélections sociales," 1896) the significance of race for the development of cultures was first demonstrated, racial differences play no role whatsoever either in state life or in general consciousness.

Count Arthur de Gobineau explained history as a struggle between superior and inferior races. The Nordic race appeared to him as the culture-bearer and culture-creator par excellence. Richard Wagner, who met with Gobineau in Rome, Venice, and Bayreuth, personally drew attention in the "Bayreuther Blätter" of the year 1881 to the work of the Count, epochal in his eyes. Wagner wrote about the "new friend" who disclosed to "us" "a chaos of impotence and ignorance."

Since the Master's enthusiasm, Wagnerians could no longer escape the spell of Gobineau. Houston Stewart Chamberlain, the Englishman with adopted homeland Germany, became the popularizer who prepared the views of the Frenchman in the dilution necessary for wide dissemination. Chamberlain, although coming from the natural sciences, primarily botany, worked mainly with "vision." Vision and comprehensive vision, he valued and loved; scientific detail work he presupposed but did not himself pursue.

Gobineau, to whose brilliant intuition we doubtless owe deeper insights into the significance of races in the life of peoples,

upon which a new philosophy of history and research wants to build, did not himself call into question the irreplaceability of moral values and also did not, despite his preference for Germanic prehistory, adopt an anti-Christian position. This racial doctrine, skillfully developed by Gobineau's students, can no longer be eliminated from German intellectual life of our day and is gradually extending to various other domains.

There already actually exist historical presentations in which the earlier division of European national development is abandoned and the deeper causes of intellectual development are sought only in race. Thus at the conference of prehistorians in Halle (October 16, 1934), the Federal Leader Professor Reinerth, who suggested the establishment of a Reich Institute for German Prehistory, could express the following thoughts after Alfred Rosenberg had previously developed the basic lines of National Socialist conception of history:

"The struggle for German prehistory did not first grow out of the questions of recent decades, but already began when under the Merovingians and Carolingians the strength of the Germans was broken through the introduction of a racially alien communal life. But simultaneously with the alienation began the struggle for what is racially kindred, which today has entered its decisive phase.

The actual enemy of a racially kindred historical view was always Romanism, which regarded the things of our prehistoric times from the perspective and with the standards of the South. When the warning is repeatedly raised from the Romanist camp that abroad could not possibly recognize Nordic thinking, it can be established in contrast that precisely the common Indo-Germanic foundation is capable of representing the strongest unifying force of European peoples. But beside the by no means easy task of enlightening foreign countries stands the no less difficult one of overcoming all enemies in one's own land."

Whoever examines the scientific foundation in the numerous works of modern race researchers will unfortunately have to determine that often only probability proofs are brought in, since science has not yet spoken the last word. No one has yet given a precise and flawless clarification of the concept and content of the word "hereditary mass" underlying all conclusions, just as little a unambiguous interpretation of the concept "race" at all.

The problems lie far more complicated than one assumes today. The racial questions are too difficult to be dismissed with catchwords. Rather, far greater caution and care in the treatment of these matters is recommended.

But perhaps with no other doctrine of National Socialism can one observe so clearly how assertions healthy in themselves, in any case debatable, must lead through exaggeration to the strangest conclusions. The doctrine that only the Nordic-Aryan race is unconditionally high-quality and alone constructive causes not a few National Socialist partisans (Miller) to condemn the Christianization of the black and yellow races not merely as a racially alien cultural intrusion into their racial values, but as harmful and useless work. Why also, if only Nordic man possesses culture-forming aptitudes that entitle him to rule, introduce into a Christian cultural world races whose destiny is merely to serve and obey?

The first consequence of racial doctrine, when it is thought through consistently and pushes into the radical, is the danger of self-aggrandizement of Nordic man toward other peoples, although Germany is estimated to be only eight percent Nordically racial and German culture represents far more a mixture of Nordic and Eastern elements. Researchers like Martin, Fischer, Pittard refuse to provide proofs for the superiority of the Nordic race, although on the other hand Eugen Fischer declared: "This Nordic blood, however, is involved everywhere in Europe where particularly significant cultures

arose." (Karlsruhe, February 22, 1934, in the regional association "Badische Heimat.") Even when it is repeatedly said that one by no means wants through this dogma of blood and race to devalue other peoples in their assessment, the entire great literature shows sufficiently that only Greeks, Germans, and in the first place the Nordic race are presented as actual culture-bearers. The further consequence is, when everything, history, culture, and religion, grows only out of race, that Christianity must unconditionally be rejected as racially alien.

Thus German religion with the cult of the Nordic and the intellectual connection to Germanic mythology will become the necessary consequence of the race dogma and the overestimation of biological-racial thoughts. However different their individual representatives may be religiously oriented, from the shimmering pantheism of the Tübingen university professor Hauer (cf. his book "Deutsche Gottschau," Stuttgart 1934) to the radical distortion of religiosity in the writings of the Tannenberg League, and however much this abuse is also rejected by serious representatives of National Socialism as absolutely contradicting the program, in their foundations they rest upon racial doctrine. One can reject German religion as unpleasant or disavow it, but it is a legitimate child as long as the race concept does not stop before encroaching upon the religious-cultural.

The third consequence of race thinking is a worldview that one can designate as pseudo-religious, anthropological materialism, racial monism, or immanence religion (idea of fate and determinism, rejection of free will). If the divine is immanent in blood and race, then revelation would be only the resonance of the national blood substance, a self-conversation, a completely naturalistic concept of revelation, but not in the sense of the Bible. It would be valuable to write a lexicon of this racial conceptual world in order to better

recognize the internal contradictions with the world of religion and the humanities.

The fourth consequence is the rejection of the Jewish people and its history also within Old Testament religion, furthermore a consideration of nation, marriage, and family only according to racial-hygienic viewpoints (education about proper choice of spouse, sterilization of the inferior).

Also considered from the perspective of religious history, the radicalization of racial doctrine and especially its reconstruction into a worldview yields manifold difficulties, however simple the problem formulation may seem at first glance. Man is lifted out of his relationship to God. He is no longer God-related but oriented toward the blood and racial unity of his people. With this begins an enormous moral revolution, carried forward by those restless popular masses who embody the movement of dechristianization, whereby it remains questionable whether they were ever Christianized at all.

Religion demands an inner, moral transformation of man, a purification of natural man, an intellectual-spiritual process that is bound to nothing given by nature, such as blood and race. One has therefore always designated the teachings of world religions in accord with those of Laozi, Plato, Dante as idealism. Through moral purification and the grace of God, man, who becomes entangled in guilt and sin through the confusion of worldly activity, comes to redemption, to liberation from spiritual distress and torment, to purification and expiation, to elevation and to a higher self. When certain newer currents, connecting to Germanic tradition and innate feeling, overlook these facts of soul life and hold the opinion that blood and race consciousness alone suffice to feel religiously and to be a moral person, this is too little. The Catholic Church by no means condemns race research, but it must see in the radicalization a relapse into naturalism that should have been overcome through the

emergence of the supernatural world religion. For disposition and mode of action are moral values whose presence may not simply be presupposed even with good racial endowment. That noble disposition is conditioned by noble blood is as much a prejudice as that racial mixing and mixed blood necessarily produce ignoble character traits.

The Church has not yet dogmatically taken a position on the race question. Before the face of God, that is in the realm of the supernatural, all races and peoples are of equal value, equal rights, and equal obligations when it concerns the ultimate goal of life. This certainly does not assert that all races are also of equal value in their natural, intellectual, moral, and physiological aptitudes. Race protection can therefore, insofar as it concerns the prevention of mixing for the purpose of procreation of children, be regarded as self-defense for a people in certain life circumstances. The Catholic Church too thought radically and consistently in its Jewish legislation, until in the nineteenth century the ghetto walls were first dismantled everywhere by the liberal state and not by the Church. For the Church's Jewish laws, however, as follows from the entire supernatural character of Christianity, religious and not national-racial considerations were initially decisive.

The entire problematic nature of the race question shows itself particularly when we wanted to examine the concept of races and culture formation. Here lie many unsolved problems. Science is not clear about whether high cultures are not precisely the result of racial mixtures, while racial purity leads to intellectual desiccation. The race problem may therefore never be explained and understood purely biologically, if materialism is not to become its consequence, which is already taught in many writings of Gobineau's students. With this, however, one comes not merely to the rejection of Christianity, which wants to lead every race into a higher life

conception and culture, but to the denial of the soul, which is the actual life principle, the form of the body. The selfishness of races and peoples would have to develop from the exaggeration of this serious question incalculable vitalities and future plans without inhibitions from the intellectual. The further consequence, however, would be a crisis of Christianity in Europe and beyond.

On the other hand, the modern race question also places Christianity before important new problems. No one can deny that since the French Revolution with its principles about national and human rights, a mixture of peoples and races is growing up in Europe in which consciousness of nationhood, race, and their high cultural values has often lost all significance.

Christian missionary work too would have made mistakes if it had regarded Christianity and European culture as two inseparably connected concepts and had believed that simultaneously with Christianity, European culture without consideration of old nationhood had to be brought to foreign nations and races. The Europeanization of other races would be the greatest harm to Christianity and all missionary work. Christianity is initially indifferent toward every culture. It forms, ennobles foreign goods and creates, as soon as this preliminary work is done, a culture corresponding to the race and people in question, carried by religious spirit, in which old elements are present and live on.

Race question and Christianity therefore need not be opposites. Only where radicalisms begin do struggles, oppositions, and difficulties also arise quite naturally, because Christianity is essentially harmonization, balance, and synthesis of nature and the supernatural.

To obtain clarity in this extraordinarily difficult question, the following propositions should suffice for an orientation from the Christian standpoint:

1. The reality of the race concept cannot be denied, even not in face of the indisputable fact that today all living races merge into one another and any sharp boundaries between individual human types are often difficult to establish. Race is more than a purely conceptual abstraction. It is a truism that the biological form groups of mankind, the races, are by no means characterized by one or several features, but by a typical overall habitus. With this, within certain limits, an inheritability of intellectual aptitudes is perhaps admitted as possible, however little the scientific results have thus far brought full clarity in detail. The few researchers who, independently of preconceived principles, have occupied themselves with this, could not yet determine with unambiguous certainty how human character traits behave in hereditary transmission. In the field of the psychic it will always be difficult to distinguish how far a particular quality through which a person in good or bad sense distinguishes himself from others is predominantly heredity-conditioned or environment-conditioned and how far heredity and environmental effect inextricably intertwine in it.

No one denies a certain heredity of intellectual aptitudes, although race is initially only a type of functional and morphological heritable characteristics, thus a purely biological fact. A solid racial science, a prudent racial cultivation, and therefore race protection within certain limits is something thoroughly desirable and necessary.

But race research must never become a playground of dilettantism. It would be regrettable if we Germans wanted to build for ourselves precisely from racial science, which can give valuable stimulation and observations of natural processes, a cultural, intellectual, and religious Germanic ghetto. Let us beware therefore of seeing in the race question the key to all world history. Race is not everything and does not explain everything either. With this rejection I find myself in good company, for one of the intellectual pioneers of

National Socialism, Moeller van den Bruck, has perhaps been the first to recognize brilliantly the weaknesses of radicalism in this young science.

2. Race is on the value scale of human goods a good, but not the highest. Racial science lacks to this day a proper conceptual explanation. When one says race is destiny, soul, in a word everything, one has thereby explained nothing, but has considerably increased the confusion. According to Christian worldview, the natural moral value scale is: God, soul, family, race, people, state, humanity.

Even conscious selection for the unmixing of races can never alone produce a moral, culturally high level of peoples, for blood mixing, despite the differential value of race, is not harmful under all circumstances.

The German imperial dynasties, the Saxons and the Staufers, who today are counted among the models of German character, by no means feared foreign blood admixture in their lineage. Marriages with Oriental princely houses were not rare. They believed their blood strong enough to absorb the foreign drop. They guarded themselves rather against inbreeding. The chain of brilliant rulers they produced has proven them right.

The racial decline of the Germans also does not come from Christianity, unless we designate the Christian German culture of the Middle Ages as an aberration and erase a millennium of German-Christian history with countless great, leading Germanic personalities. The racial decline begins much later and was brought about not least also by the harnessing of human masses in economic large-scale enterprises and their accumulation in large cities, by the detachment of healthy peasant offspring from the soil, in a word not least by industrialization, thus not at all from the worldview.

Many peasant families in our Alpine lands, who sit for centuries on their hereditary farm, with 10 to 15 children, who are Christian and nationally minded, by no means give the impression that they have been racially degenerated from the worldview. They already show through their large offspring that they are racially much healthier than the many representatives of this racial science who often have scarcely two children, although they could write very beautifully about the significance of race for our German people.

3. Human intellectual life is only secondarily blood and body-conditioned, and the question is for the time being not clearly decided how far the inherited bodily aptitudes can influence intellectual life in the sense of a particular racial habitus. We lack an occupational and quality statistics within families, nations, and races.

The intellectual element in man is not an emanation of the corporeal, for the laws of heredity that the Sudeten German Catholic priest Johann Gregor Mendel of Brno established for plants cannot simply be transferred to intellectual life. Culture is also something metaphysical and not merely bound to hereditary values. To deny the fact that spirit can also overcome race and blood means a monistic explanation of the intellectual as a mere function of the body, but ultimately pressing "man" down into a general abstract concept to which in reality nothing corresponds.

4. Races are nothing rigid, given since primeval times, but like all life in constant change, in tension between differences and equalization; in other words, the purely biological explanation of German racial doctrine is insufficient if the indisputably great role of the intellectual as moving moment is not also taken into account. The uncertainty of race thinking in physical respect makes it, according to previous scientific research, extremely dangerous, even if one wanted to disregard the foundations of a Christian philosophy, to build upon it in the first place an entire state policy or a formal worldview.

5. Racial doctrine makes an intramundane subjective moment the criterion of our position toward religion, whereas Christianity as divine revelation is not measured by any intramundane standard. In the final respect it leads to the reinterpretation of religion, culture, and spirit in the sense of biology, whereas Christianity, already on the basis of its teaching of the unified origin of the human race, sees in every human being, without regard to what race he may belong, the immortal soul and the image of God, who was redeemed with Christ's blood. Man is, judged from a Christian perspective, a spiritual personality, not merely a function of the racially or nationally vital. Thus racial doctrine, as soon as it is shifted from medicine and biology to the domain of culture, must lead to the denial of a fundamental presupposition of Christianity. In face of the actual dependence of man on his natural aptitudes, if one does not finally want to call into question the freedom of will in action, there must be emphasized the freedom of will or choice, the influence of the educational forces of environment, the extraordinary powers of God's grace, and the blessing effects of a religious life in the Church, which can, if not completely eliminate natural racial aptitudes, though only in rare cases with morally heroic personalities, at least mitigate, weaken, and ennoble them.

The radical race researchers too speak of spirit and soul, but these concepts do not coincide with those of Christian philosophy. Whoever therefore exaggerates the race idea must with inexorable necessity come to the rejection of Christianity. He may for reasons of utility or aesthetic considerations want to retain components of Christianity. In the long run he cannot, if he is an honest German man and researcher, unite Christian worldview and radical racial doctrine and avoid the conclusions.

We must have the courage, in the interest of racial science, this young discipline that cannot yet look back upon long

observation, to work against the conceptual obfuscation of our time and to give back to words and concepts their epistemological original meaning, for our present demands from educated and intellectually active people far more sacrifices of the intellect than the Church in the two millennia of its history would ever have dared to demand. How much the liberal person of the nineteenth century resisted against the acceptance of unchangeable dogmas! How many new dogmas, which cannot look back upon two millennia of intellectual culture, must today be believed without contradiction! Where today is the primacy of science?

The great problematic nature that lies in all modern race research, as soon as one shifts its principles from biology to the domain of intellectual culture, can be eliminated only through serious individual research, but never through authoritarian dictates. In no other domain therefore is the objectivity of thinking and freeing oneself from fantasies and dilettantism that have nothing to do with true science, the clarity of concepts, solid philosophical training, and Christian worldview so necessary as in that of racial science, if we do not want to become the victim of contemporary currents and with this racial doctrine, in which valuable thoughts are contained, shake Christianity and thereby the last moral hold in the hearts of the nations of Europe.

The dangers of racial doctrine therefore begin only where its principles and assertions overstep the boundaries and want to encroach upon the domain of philosophy. In their exaggeration they are a new intrusion of materialism into our German intellectual culture.

4. THE JEWISH QUESTION. (ANTISEMITISM).

The iron consistency with which National Socialist literature proceeds precisely in this difficult question, without regard for the effects in world commercial and foreign policy respects, can only be explained by the fact that the National Socialist position toward the Jewish problem represents a necessary conclusion from racial doctrine from the viewpoint of national self-defense. The Jewish question appears as a racial phenomenon. All laws are from this viewpoint, however harshly they may sound, nothing other than an uncompromising implementation of the dogma of race. The history of antisemitism, better said of the attempted solution of the Jewish question, goes back in Germany and Austria to the middle of the nineteenth century. Curiously, the first scientific founders of antisemitism were Jews.

The rapid intrusion of Jewry, which rolled in a kind of second great migration from East to Europe, the strengthening of the national idea in those states that had to suffer particularly under this intrusion, substantially promoted this movement, which could receive a certain scientific foundation from various writers. There were soon two directions. One treated this question as pure racial opposition, the other saw in it only an unbearable tension between different nationhoods. In the former case it soon became a frontal attack against the Jewish person as such. Added to this was the fact that the Jews themselves since the Zionist movement form no unity but a divided people, at least in Central Europe, since one part would like to assimilate to the host people, while the other strives for the opposite and declares it as ideal.

That the German Jews fall under the concept of a national unity is for most an experience for which they were hardly psychologically prepared. They themselves do not regard themselves as a national unity, are manifold and deeply divided, although their opponents believe they have to do with a "secret society" sworn to life

and death. The reality is different and proves itself precisely in the reaction to National Socialism, which was and is anything but unified. Whoever speaks simply of "the Jew" without specifying remains on the surface. The Sephardic Jew of Spanish-Dutch origin does not want to be confused with the Ashkenazi from the East, the long-established Western Jew has more reservations against the newly immigrated from the East than an Aryan, the Orthodox does not understand the baptized, the bourgeois does not understand the social revolutionary, the latter does not understand the nationally minded Jewish front fighter: the worldview as well as partisan splits of the German people affected the Jews in exact correspondence. Zionism as a Jewish-national idea has indeed experienced a certain boost through the shock of the German upheaval; to the great mass it remains foreign as utopia and the two-thousand-year national historical vacuum a more compelling reality. It concerns in a much more radical sense than with the Germans a "people without space." Neither from below (blood and soil ideology) nor from above (intellectual religious reflection and revival) can a self-conscious Jewish unity be achieved. Here too one encounters, already as a result of the frequent and centuries-long mixing with German blood, questions of unforeseeable complexity. Burdened with this uncertainty, the entire question has become since the nineties a catchword of many political parties in Germany and Austria.

Antisemitism is therefore in a certain respect an East German border land problem transferred to the Reich, grown in that space in which Germandom has to assert itself against Slavs, Magyars, Romanians, and first represented on a larger political scale by a significant man, the Viennese mayor Karl Lueger, who however advocated an intellectual-religious, not a biological position and as a Christian Social declared himself against "assimilation through baptism." The shift of accent to the race question has changed the

situation. Racial biology does not ask about the disposition of the individual Jew toward state and host people, but about blood as the mystical germinal ground of disposition. Only thereby has the entire Jewish problem become popular in party circles and made into the great theme of German future in Rosenberg's "Myth of the Twentieth Century." From the consciousness of the "German racial soul," which is designated as heroic, aristocratic, state-building, creative, and good-natured, a sharp national front against Jewry is supposed to stand out, which is designated as unheroic, selfish, incapable of faith, negating, summarized in one catchword as "corrosive." Although objective research is still stuck in a forest of undecided questions, characteristics are already distributed according to an a priori schema, whereby no one wants to deny certain psychic racial peculiarities and predispositions. A highly complicated problem is supposed to find in National Socialism an apparently highly simple solution. Thus the ethical problem is transformed into a moral one; a race as such is burdened with moral defects as constitutive dowry. The National Socialist position toward Jewry was prepared by artists, politicians, race researchers, religious historians, philosophers, and liberal theology professors. Especially Friedrich Delitzsch and Fritsch, whose "Handbook of Jewry" has today become the dogmatics of National Socialism in this regard, wanted to prove from an intuitive understanding that the God (Yahweh) of the Old Testament is not to be equated with the God of the New Testament and therefore the Christian religion also cannot be that of the Germans, on the basis of allegedly intolerable moral views of the Old Testament from the Germanic side. Moreover, the value of the Old Testament is diminished, moral transgressions of individual personalities, which are only reported by the Bible but not approved, are explained as an outflow of Jewish decadence, whereas all truly

great thoughts are traced back to Persians and Sumerians (creation of the world, God the Creator, savior of the world).

The antisemitic movement in the German people cannot be judged fairly, however, if one does not take into account the national geography of Central Europe, where, since the French Revolution had established the state-political equality of all people and races, an uncanny immigration of Eastern elements took place, which soon appropriated all leading intellectual life among the Germans. Already before the seizure of power by National Socialism in Germany, much was said in the Reich about this question, but it remained a small circle that drew its knowledge more from the antisemitic press of individual parties instead of from profound scientific works, in order to reflect on the consequences of this Jewish immigration making itself felt ever more strongly in the entire German-speaking area. In the Catholic camp the scope of this problem for the entire German cultural life was too little appreciated by the leading politicians, although we owe the first pilot warnings against this national distress precisely to Catholic writers, who however unfortunately remained largely unnoticed or were strongly attacked.

Thomas Aquinas, incidentally, already in the thirteenth century in his writing "On the Governance of the Jews" expressed himself about the economic predominance of the Jews in a manner that hardly lags behind some modern antisemites. Also the Jewish laws of various church councils and diocesan synods of the Middle Ages show kinship with modern measures, even if the foundation is not of racial-biological but theological origin. The German and French authoritative antisemitic literature, however, has increasingly fallen into the waters of radicalism since the middle of the nineteenth century. Doubtlessly we thus stand here before an important question of the German people. The rich statistics of the spread of Jewry in the intellectual professions since 1890 is shattering when

one confronts it with the fact that the sons of long-established national families, who thus had a birthright, had to remain without positions for years because foreigners took away their daily bread. Especially Marxism in Germany and Austria everywhere it came to power deliberately and ruthlessly exploited its power to the advantage of immigrant Jewry, which in turn supported the socialist movement with rich financial means. Disproportionately high was the percentage of Jews in hospitals (Vienna, Berlin), in the legal profession, in the free artistic professions, in the press, not to speak of the financial world. The consequence had to be a poisoning of the German soul with foreign conceptions and teachings, since not always the still believing, conservatively oriented stratum of Jewry pressed to power, but the religiously and morally disintegrated. Jewry first fought for its equal rights through the French Revolution at the end of the eighteenth century. Since this event, which one repeatedly heard praised in liberal circles as the beginning of the new age and the modern constitutional state, the numerous defensive measures and laws of the Catholic Church of the Middle Ages regarding the position of Jews in Christian society were increasingly dismantled under state influence.

Liberalism at all considered the existence of a Jewish question incompatible with its worldview principles and therefore closed itself before this unwelcome problem. While the Church of the Middle Ages showed a strict position on the question of mixed marriages with Jews, this problem as such could no longer be appreciated and understood to the same extent since the nineteenth century as a result of state inhibitions. With not too great inhibition, many authorities also granted dispensation from the impediment of difference of religion, without considering that ultimately it concerns not only the question whether the other party is ready for practical Christianity, but whether this mixture from the standpoint of

religion and nationhood actually always appears recommendable. Only very few German scholars have dealt with the problem of Jewry in German history, partly from underestimation of the question, partly from fear of having to take a position on a delicate question. Thus there also exists no high-quality history of the Jews in the German-speaking area corresponding to the national thinking of the German people. There are some omissions here, because this difficult problem was either not observed at all in its cultural effect or was to be solved only from the standpoint of language. In any case, this predominance of Jews, which can be proven statistically with ease, in the cultural institutions of the German people could no longer continue; the excessive penetration of Jews into secondary and higher schools, in the medical and legal professions was all the less tenable because, not to emphasize it once more with decisiveness, young German men wanted to find their bread, found a family, place their abilities in the service of people and state, and had to watch unemployed and destitute while disproportionately many of these positions were kept occupied by Jews. The danger that this unfulfilled waiting turns into dangerous radicalisms was only too understandable. Also in cinema, press, theater, the influence of Jews was overpowering in proportion to their population number and truly often disastrous enough. Since the middle of the nineteenth century, many attempted solutions of the Jewish question were handed over to the public; particularly that found strong approval which wanted to transform the Jewish people into a kind of minority nation with the resulting rights and duties in the state. The further consequence would naturally be that beside national membership there would also have to be state citizenship with specific legal effects. The well-known writer Wilhelm Stapel, to whom National Socialism owes some stimulation, writes on the occasion of the new Reich laws on maintaining the purity of the Aryan race in the journal

"Deutsches Volkstum" published by him that hitherto there had been between Germans and Jews a condominium, a coeducation, a connubium, a commercium. In other words: the Jew was simply German. Now the condominium is abolished, co-rule in the German authoritarian state is forbidden to the Jews. Stapel says: "They will never again make German policy, but only policy against or with Germany." Thus no German policy, but policy with Germany, which ultimately would be German policy again!

Thus Stapel outlines today's regulation and appends the following reflection: "When we survey the result of the separation on the Jewish side, we believe future generations will regard the year 1933 as a year of salvation of the Jewish people; by the defeat of assimilation, nationhood (together with faith) became mighty." Christianity knows—Protestants too admit this—no Aryan paragraph for admission into its faith community, if an essential foundation of Christian faith is not to be shaken. Thus Jewish baptism and mixed marriages will also be permitted for the future. The ecclesiastical legal code, which came into force on May 19, 1918, knows no provisions of an anti-Jewish kind and speaks only of unbaptized non-Catholics, but not of Jews. Thus the Church will also not recognize the racial side of Jewish baptism and a mixed marriage, without therefore wanting to intervene against the restriction of Jewish influence in state life, since it is an empirical fact that the assimilation of Jews to foreign nationhood often remains purely superficial. Therefore no serious objection could be raised against state legislation that protects one's own nationhood out of self-defense and against a flooding of foreign elements and issues certain exceptional provisions for members of the Jewish people from state-political and national grounds, even if such laws do not correspond to the modern constitutional state, for the principles of the modern state, which were first created through the French

Revolution, are not the best from the standpoint of Christianity and nationhood. Least of all, however, do those non-Aryans have a right to lodge protest against this Reich legislation who are materialistically oriented and deny the spirituality of man with an immortal soul. Such Jews will have to accept that they are judged only racially-biologically and also within our German people can no longer be of equal value and equal rights, for only the acceptance of a soul and faith in the supernatural can preserve from exaggerations.

The error of some leading National Socialist writers lies, however, in this doubly delicate question, since Jewry represents an economic and intellectual world power, more in another domain, namely in that radicalization which ultimately traces back all dark sides in the history of peoples only to Jewry and which in its conclusion leads to the rejection of the Old Testament, furthermore to the reinterpretation of the personality of Christ, who because of non-Aryan origin remains hardly tolerable for radically oriented antisemitism. In fact, history teaches that the exaggeration of the Jewish question has almost always ended with the abandonment of Christianity (Marcion), and it is noteworthy that all radical representatives of antisemitism particularly reject Catholicism.

Also in this question one can say that in the attitude of individual representatives of National Socialism toward the Old Testament the great liquidation process of liberal Protestant theology and Bible interpretation is carried out, which is given by the names Delitzsch and Gressmann, and it is particularly noteworthy that these destructive thoughts, which today are long since rejected even by serious Protestant scholarship, now find their way into the people to be undesirable worldview accompanying phenomena of political movements.

It further shows that racial antisemitism partially wants with its attack to strike not only Jewry but Christianity, which is

rejected as "racially alien," "Oriental" religion and whose "morality of compassion" and "ideal of humility" are designated as incompatible with the spirit of an aristocratic master people. On this plane two claims to chosenness collide in hostility: the Jewish, divinely revealed, of the people chosen through grace, and the German, autocratically established from the national or racial consciousness of the fullness and consecration of one's own essence, in which an earthly rank determination is expressed. Thus says the previously cited Wilhelm Stapel in his book "The Christian Statesman" (1932): "If only two Germans lived in all of Poland, they would be more than the millions of Poles; for they are simply Germans." German and Jewish consciousness of mission meet in the depths.

The problem is clearly elaborated in the official announcement in the "Church Gazette for the Archdiocese of Cologne," where in a subsequent special study on Rosenberg's "Myth" one reads: "There are namely really specifically Jewish views that Jesus and Paul fought with equal determination. These views have their root in the idea of a preeminence of the Jewish race before all other peoples. This idea does not stem from the Old Testament, for which Israel possesses only a preeminence in grace, but not one of race. Later Judaism, however, has—and this is its world-historical guilt and the ultimate cause of its downfall—reinterpreted the privilege of grace proclaimed by the Old Testament into a natural preeminence of its race. Cause and effect were exchanged; no longer does Israel's privilege rest on God's grace as in the Old Testament, but God's grace rests on Israel because it is the noblest among all peoples... This is that truly Jewish teaching against which already John the Baptist, although himself a Jew, protested, as also the Jew Matthew transmitted (3:9); against which Jesus conducted an uninterrupted struggle; ... over which, when it also threatened the

young Church of Christ, no other won the decisive victory than Paul."

From this follows an important determination in face of the attempt to understand and solve the Jewish question only from race.

Christianity is the overcoming of the racial deification first manifested and dogmatized in the late phase of Israelite history, which in contrast to scientific race research is thus no modern creation; where therefore in the advanced age of European national history Christianity loses its binding force, the possibility of a racial deification arises anew. This Jewish-German historical parallel across two millennia is deeply remarkable. It is confirmed by the fact that even today in genuine German Christianity the Jewish problem does not gain this sharpness.

Before, however, such a difficult problem as the Jewish question represents can be solved according to a scientifically still disputed racial standpoint, the question would have to receive a clarification unambiguously as to since when Jewry in the history of other peoples appears at all as a corrosive power, for such a generally held reproach as some raise appears unfounded, even if individual writers want to find it in the official motivation for Reich German race protection legislation of the year 1935. With assertions alone one cannot justify any radicalism, even if Jewry through its strong share in the Marxist and especially in the Bolshevik movement has in many respects brought about the current Reich German legislation itself. Therefore there lies in the legal legislation, which is based on Rosenberg, Stapel, and Fritsch, even if some restrictions have already been made, still always a certain harshness, as soon as one wants to liquidate from the racial principle the legacy of Jewish emancipation, the question of mixed-race persons and Jewish front fighters, in a manner appearing just to all parties.

We as Christians and Catholics have not the slightest occasion to defend that Jewry which after the World War seized the leadership of the worker masses in the sense of Marxism and abused it amply enough for selfish purposes; but precisely because we condemn every injustice, we guard ourselves against a generalization, as if in history only Jewry had been responsible for social and political grievances.

True is, however, that particularly in the postwar period a considerable part of Jewish intelligentsia in disastrous craving for recognition joined the subversive parties and in their ranks, especially in Austria, Germany, and Hungary, assumed a decisive position—we do not want to speak here of Russia, where the entire middle and lower party apparatus is Judaized—and that induction currents of a dangerous kind were conducted from this religiously disintegrated Jewry into the entire political life of the German people. This happened doubtless without and against the will of the great majority of those Jews who are oriented in a conservative and state-preserving sense. This majority has deeply lamented the political and social aberrations of their co-religionists, already therefore lamented because it had to suffer under the hatred that the Jewish left extremists had loaded upon themselves. This great majority, at least of the long-established indigenous Jewry, also never had the ambition to exercise an undue influence in public life, but only harbored the wish to devote itself in peace with Christian fellow citizens to peaceful work and gainful activity. The reproach, however, cannot be left unspoken that this best part also of Reich German Jewry failed to draw between itself and the red swarm spirits a clear line of separation and to express clearly before all the world that here no community of views and efforts prevails. It was omitted perhaps from falsely understood solidarity, perhaps from the apprehension that through such protests attention would first be directed to the

unedifying fact. But it was misguided to want to pass so diplomatically by a fact that was anyway known to all the world, and the success was only that through this silence an argument was delivered to active racial antisemitism that did not miss its effect. Despite all this: It is historically false and morally never to be justified to book the aberrant activity of a part of Jewry as proof for the discrimination of all Jews living among the Germans. Many Jews have completely merged into foreign nationhood and have accomplished outstanding achievements in it. Only insofar as Jewry has lost its religious foundations and is worldview uprooted did it actually have to become corrosive for others. In other words, the fate of Jews among peoples and thereby the Jewish problem at all cannot in the final respect be explained merely from the fact of a different race or only from the political sphere, but necessarily also requires a theological orientation, in order not to arrive at unjust views in the effort to protect one's own nationhood that would contradict not merely truth but also purely human humanity.

From the standpoint of mere physical race, incidentally, the Jews stand closer to the Germans than, for example, the Finno-Ugric and Altaic peoples (Magyars, Turks), since one of their racial components is the Mediterranean element, which forms the main component of the "Aryan" Mediterranean peoples and is also represented in the German people, and another component is the Oriental element, whose main bearers are the "Aryan" Armenians. The problem of the Jewish people in its totality is thus racially not to be enclosed at all in any of the usual categories, and it rests in its foundation not on material but on intellectual factors (not on the physical factor of "blood" but on the intellectual factor of a historical act of will). The Jewish people has become homeless and has not found its national vocation since the downfall of its own state system. For the understanding of Jewry in world history, the downfall of its

own state system in the year 586 is of decisive significance. When we compare the books of the Old Testament that appeared after this event, we already encounter two directions that have since become typical for all Jewry: 1. The wisdom literature with a world philosophy that partially touches the cosmopolitan cultural ideal of declining Hellenism, although the religious mission of Jewry is always clearly emphasized again in these books, 2. a national direction that comes to expression in the Maccabean books with the struggle for the true kingdom. Since then the Jews are a people without homeland, the constant emigrants of world history, whose unrest within foreign cultural circles also goes back to the loss of this national center. It is a completely general empirical fact of history that all nations and races in their tranquility and problematic nature essentially depend on whether the natural development given on the basis of language and race receives a certain satisfaction or not.

5. THE PROBLEM OF RACIAL INFLUENCE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF WESTERN CHRISTIANITY

The two preceding sections have already shown with clarity that Christianity faces danger from racial science only when its principles are shifted as the sole guiding force into the realm of culture and worldview, instead of being confined to medicine, biology, and population policy. In many questions of this young science, the last word has certainly not yet been spoken. If the former occurs, then one would indeed have to speak of a crisis of the existing Christian culture in all of Europe.

In what follows, to deepen the insights already gained, a section shall be examined that among radical racial researchers today is brought to the center of attention almost more strongly than social problems: What position does the racial question occupy within the

development of Western Christianity, in other words, is Western Christianity merely the result of the Mediterranean-Romance cultural sphere and the races dwelling within it?

Since the brilliant Augustinian canon regular Mendel scientifically observed the hereditary laws of nature in the solitude of his monastery in Brno, since Gobineau and Richard Wagner, both not by scientific means but through artistic intuition, popularized the problem of racial influence on intellectual culture, this question has not come to rest. According to the radical representatives, it is gradually becoming a world problem that also resonates somehow in various political movements (India, Mexico, and Japan). The question of the ultimate determining components of culture has, however, not been exhaustively solved by anyone to this day. The purely organic explanation of intellectual life that Spengler and long before him Danilevsky attempted through the doctrine of culture-historical types or souls cannot satisfy. It is self-evident that precisely the universal Church of Rome, which has also imprinted a certain ethos upon the cultures of peoples who have become Christian, cannot remain untouched by these great controversies that are now once and for all connected with the racial problem.

A flood of questions now storms in upon every modern person who wishes to examine, above the confused political picture of Europe, those intellectual currents that give our contemporary history color and rhythm.

Is the struggle against Rome, which we find in all centuries and among all peoples at certain epochs of their intellectual development, actually caused by race? Is it primarily in the relations of the Germanic peoples to Rome a question of a revolt of the German genius and its religiosity against the "racially alien" form of Christianity and against Romanism, which is supposed to be embodied in Catholicism? Can a cultural history and intellectual

history of peoples be written at all from the racial standpoint according to the previous results of this young science?

Can influences of race be demonstrated at all in Christian theology? And the surging stream of contemporary history raises so many other questions.

Several preliminary remarks are necessary. The racial question is a biological and cultural-intellectual problem. As racial hygiene, this question belongs to the realm of medicine and biology, whereby morality will always have a voice as well, because it often concerns borderline questions of both realms. However, the question becomes more complicated when one shifts the problem of race to the cultural realm and wishes to examine the modern catchword of "racial soul."

What is racial soul at all? Does this concept contain only certain biological dispositions for character formation, or is the overall attitude of man toward the questions of life determined by blood? In other words: Does religious worldview also have its deepest roots in blood and race?

In the Christian worldview, three things form the human type, its character and personality: the hereditary stream or hereditary mass, in which race is conditioned, the environment, and the soul as the form of the body.

If one confronts this view with radical racial science, one sees that from both two essentially different conceptions speak to us: first, biological monism, in which blood also plays the decisive role for culture and religious formation and which ends in a biologically conceived psycho-physical parallelism, according to which body and soul represent the inner and outer sides of one and the same self, and second, anthropological dualism, which has also fought for a leading position in Greek philosophy since Aristotle through the doctrine of

matter and form and constitutes the very foundation of every theistic religion, in whatever dogmatic bindings it may approach man.

If we wished to investigate more deeply this problem-setting that racial science has given to Christianity, which however exceeds the framework of this book, a series of questions would have to be carefully examined; above all, the influence of climate and soil formation on the becoming and passing away of cultures would have to be determined.

To what degree is the soul and thus intellectual life also co-influenced by race? To what extent does the separation of mankind, one in origin, according to races have physical and to what extent also spiritual significance? No scientific racial research has yet given an answer to this that can fully satisfy.

All races and nations, as soon as they pass from the nomadic state into that of civilization, contribute to the overall intellectual progress of mankind. Or are there races that can be designated in advance as inferior and corrosive? Are there furthermore culturally autochthonous peoples whose creative impulse requires neither models nor borrowings from other cultural spheres?

Since the first beginnings of culture are lost among all peoples in the twilight of history and legend, it is difficult to determine in individual cases from where the first impulses and borrowings came, what is racially original at all and what has already been cultivated. Nevertheless, the following assertions, upon which the following thoughts are built, do not seem too bold: By culture I understand the harmonious, logical development of life based on a particular worldview. In other words: culture is something rare, narrowly bounded; most people do not progress beyond a certain civilization. Cultures are something organic; they build upon preceding ones, live from their treasures and shape and enrich them. There exist not only national cultures but also a culture of humanity

in the sense of humanitas and above all of Christianity, in which the highest achievements of all cultural spheres somehow come together. That between nations and races there exist not only physical-biological but also intellectual differences, which possibly also have a certain co-determination in race itself, cannot be denied. Thus, to take only a few examples, the ancient concept of the state among Greeks and Romans is already essentially different. Patria does not mean the same thing for both. The foundations of the concept of the state are, for the Romans in the epoch of their world imperialism, external organization and legal union, but for the Greeks, at least in the first centuries up to Alexander the Great, more the language-bound national character. The old Roman wanted to absorb and coordinate everything culturally; he did not know the concept of national minority rights.

As soon as a people begins to think in world-historical and culturally imperialistic terms at all, state and national conceptions change quite automatically without regard to racial foundations.

Religious history also shows us differences among nations and races. The conception of the divine heaven and its inhabitants is not the same among the oriental peoples, in Hellas, and in Germania. The architecture of temple buildings in the Orient and in Europe also presupposes different dispositions of the peoples. But is it absolutely necessary to seek the cause of these differences only in race? Would it not be possible that the cause is to be sought in soil formation, in climate, furthermore in the extraordinarily rich abundance of possibilities with which the freely creative spirit often shapes life and environment quite independently? Is there not in the intellectual realm a leadership with followership? Perhaps today one overemphasizes too much the effects of soil, climate, race, and blood, so that the danger of a new materialism in historical explanation threatens. Perhaps much is less congenial to racial character than we

claim today. There are therefore actually many questions here that are raised by modern racial science and that, if examined dispassionately, might someday enrich our knowledge to distinguish the true from the false, the subjective from the correct.

In and of itself, therefore, it is not necessary that Christianity and racial science come into opposition, since both represent only different orders. The oppositions begin, however, where one simply wishes to explain life biologically, without any consideration for spirit and soul.

Irreconcilable with Christianity, which enters history as divine revelation to overcome all national religions in a universal idea of God and salvation, would therefore be to overemphasize racial theory to such an extent that even the Christian religion in dogma, cult, and organization appears exclusively as a syncretism of certain races or cultural spheres caused biologically by blood. This radicalization of the racial idea would ultimately mean a materialization of religion and, by way of a blood myth, a return to the monistic philosophy of religion of Haeckel, in whom indeed many see the precursor of these modern endeavors, in other words would result in the complete annihilation of Christianity.

The great problematic that still lies in the modern racial problem, as soon as one transfers it from biology and medicine to philosophy and intellectual history, can only be eliminated through serious individual research, in which science must also have the necessary freedom, but not through authoritarian dictates. It is not worthwhile here to refute the claim that only the Nordic race in prehistoric times carried light into the darkness of unexplored continents and thereby created all the cultures of the world, that blood mixture conditions a sinking of racial level and thereby the dying out of high cultures. Just as in German history numerous

outstanding personalities have been mixed-bloods from two or three European races, so it was also in antiquity.

Three cultural spheres intersect at the beginning of the Christian era. The Semitic, which intellectually and linguistically extends from the Old Testament into the New Testament period, the Greek in the sense of Hellenism, and the Latin-Roman, since the Romans through Pompey incorporated Syria-Palestine and through Augustus also Egypt into their world empire. The bearers of Christian teaching were therefore initially members of three nations, each of which had again absorbed various races.

Each of these nations, which showed no small intellectual differences among themselves, brought certain dispositions and volitional predispositions into Christianity. The Jewish people, which only in post-exilic times in the fifth century under Ezra introduced a racial ordering, while earlier cultural influences of the Canaanites, Babylonians, Egyptians, and Hittites are demonstrable, brought into its religious mission a special metaphysical sense. In no other religious literature of antiquity do we find such breadth of thought, such anxious concern for preservation of monotheism, and such wonderful depth of religiousness as in the Psalms and in the Prophets. In no other historical presentation of ancient times is the purely human also portrayed without any idealization and one-sidedness as in the books of the Old Testament. Just as the people are portrayed even in the highest positions there, so they are also in reality among all peoples. It is the universally human that has such a moving effect.

When the problem of racial influence within religions, especially Christianity, is discussed, one must therefore warn against every one-sided position that today is not infrequently found under the influence of antisemitism toward the history and literature of the Old Testament.

Marcion too, the Christian Gnostic of the second century, who found his interpreter and modern defender in Harnack, rejected the Old Testament. Luther also makes remarkable confessions and statements about the Old Testament. However, with these opponents of the Old Testament, the motives were often of purely theological origin: world-fleeing enthusiasms of the second century toward the life-affirming position of the Old Testament, a one-sided emphasis on the Christian path of salvation, or aberrant conceptions of the "essence of Christianity." The aversion of modern racial researchers toward the Old Testament comes, however, ultimately from a purely biological consideration of history, which positively results in an incompatibility of the Old Testament religion with "German piety."

This attempt to derive all events biologically from ineradicable racial instincts, to degrade spirit and faith to functions of blood, and to brand every racial mixture as inferior, leads via Gobineau, Renan, Delitzsch, and Chamberlain into those antisemitic fantasies of our days that have received their prophets and dogmaticians especially in Dinter and Fritsch. In the process one completely forgets that the religious content of the Old Testament was only preparation, to be completed and partially superseded first in Christianity, that therefore its religious and moral value had to be relative in many respects, adapted to particular cultural conditions.

Peculiar are the justifications with which today, simultaneously with the state-legally demanded antisemitism, one endeavors to reject ancient religious material upon which Christianity built. Thus one reproaches the Old Testament for having too little heroic character in its content. But whoever denies the heroic spirit of the Old Testament would have to ignore all military reports from the period of the Judges and the first Kingdom, although these in heroic disposition, though also in wildness of

tradition, hardly lag behind the deeds of ancient Germanic warriors. It is, incidentally, one of the great errors of the present, which it has inherited from Nietzsche, that one does not place heroism in the moral sphere of man but repeatedly equates it with military imperialism, although the true heroes of mankind have not always been the world conquerors but the world overcomers. A severing of the bond between Old and New Testament on grounds of racial doctrine means the end for both, for their connection is not only historical but organic. A Gospel purified of everything "Jewish" remains a utopia and would no longer be a Gospel.

We therefore find in the Christianization process of the ancient Germans not the slightest contradiction to the content of the Old Testament, no instinctive recoiling, no blood-determined rejection of the "alien" or "racially foreign" material. Rather, there is a lively grasping and interest in the books of the Old Testament because they contained something that the ancient Germanic religion did not possess: belief in one and the same divinity for all peoples. The Old Testament religious literature shows at various places a universal conception of the idea of God that has nothing to do with a veneration of the forces of nature of primitive peoples or a mere tribal deity Yahweh, but positively urges toward the continuation and ennoblement of the idea of God in Christianity.

The Greek nation was chosen only in the Christian era to contribute, from its genius that was especially suited for speculation, to the deepening of the dogma of Christ's personality and that of the Holy Spirit.

The third cultural sphere is formed by the Romans: To the Roman genius Providence had reserved the great mission to use its disposition for the development of the Church in organizational respects. The Roman brought from his national and racial disposition into the history of Christianity the sense for form and

clear ordering of thoughts and concepts, for organization and conquest, for the soberly real and the objective attitude. Perhaps there is a symbol for the assessment of the Roman genius within Western intellectual history—it is the wonderful structure of the ancient Pantheon, whose architecture was taken over as a crowning conclusion in a brilliant intuition of shared elements by Michelangelo for the most powerful building of Western Christianity, for St. Peter's. In no other building are the relationships surveyable in such a pure manner and in an absolutely clearly harmonious self-containment that is built upon the simplest numbers and proportions. An architecture in which everything is balanced and all conflicts are resolved, in which everything merges into one another in the blissful feeling of the harmony of life and the unity of worldview.

The Germanic influence begins in the history of Western Christianity with the eighth and ninth centuries, and it shows how much the Nordic character in particular needed partial supplementation through the characteristics of the Romance cultural sphere in order always to be a positive element of further development in Christianity. The Germanic person has, with the tremendous energies of will, also a strong tendency to generalize the subjectively experiential and from it to form a doctrinal system, to overemphasize the religious inner life and the inner authority of individual conscience toward external claims of authority, to strongly emphasize the dynamic. An impulse toward activity and an inclination toward the philosopher and reformer characterize the Nordic race.

Whoever considers these only fleetingly sketched differences of those peoples who have intervened most strongly in a leading way in Christian history will understand the intellectual controversies of Christianity more easily. The separation of the Eastern peoples from Rome therefore also had completely different backgrounds than, for

example, that of the Nordic-Germanic peoples in the days of the Reformation. Oriental Christianity has, to touch upon only one thing, already in the first centuries adopted a completely different attitude toward the state than, for example, the Western Church. In the East, Christianity has either become completely an organ of the state and national history, or it has distanced itself from both in all worldly matters and withdrawn only to the purely religious (liturgy, dogma, and monasticism). Thus also the monastic ideal in Eastern Christianity is oriented only toward the pure inner life, so to speak selfishly. Orders like that of the Jesuits and the modern congregations of the Roman Church, in which something of the conquering impulse of the apostolic age lives on, are unthinkable there because they seem to contradict the speculative character disposition and religious mentality of the East, which is strongly oriented toward the hereafter and has revealed the military conquering impulse only in the religion of Islam. It is as if Christianity in this part of the earth had completely exhausted itself in the religious struggles of the first centuries and lost its conquering power. The great theologians of the Eastern Church of the Middle Ages have brought no new viewpoints into the overall development of Christianity but simply continued to spin out the christological and eschatological controversies of the first five centuries. Thus Christianity in this part of the earth also had no political power to withstand the assault of Islam. With the fall of Constantinople in the fifteenth century, it collapsed powerlessly like a house of cards.

When Christianity made its entrance into Rome in the age of Claudius, this city was inhabited by a racial mixture. The Rome of that time was the classical soil of a mixed culture. Alongside the Greek-Roman high culture in the educated upper class, there existed an ordinary popular culture in which, in terms of worldview, strong

influences of the Egyptians, Etruscans, Phoenicians, and ancient Roman history lived on.

What elements could be taken over into Christianity from this racially and ideologically manifoldly composed soil that undertook the triumphal march into the Empire from Rome? With this question, for the person who still affirms Christianity with faith, it cannot concern the essence of Christianity, which as divine revelation and world religion cannot be bound to any cultural sphere, to any race or nation. The question concerns the cultic-organizational and the external manifestations, the peripheral, in a word the contemporary historical in Christianity, in which the objective, eternal, and universally valid truths that cannot be bound to any national character or race appear, as in a prism the rays of sunlight are refracted.

What does Catholicism owe to Roman culture? In order to give an answer to this difficult problem, we must take into account an important fact that creates clarity. Rome adopted Christianity in a particular, closed form that was already given through the books of the Old and New Testaments, for the biblical books that were composed in Rome and completed the canon of sacred books could no longer change the overall religious picture in its essential components. No one will claim that, for example, the Gospel of Mark written down in Rome around 62/63 or the Pauline letters to the Ephesians, Colossians, to Philemon and to Timothy—in the case of the Letter to the Hebrews, only probability speaks for Rome as the place of composition—portrays Christianity as it appears to us in the other books essentially differently and above all contains Roman influences that are to be explained only from the racial mixture of the world city and its cultural indigenous soil, in which there was precisely in the imperial period a strong Greek admixture.

The controversies between Greek philosophy and the Bible had already found their expression several centuries earlier in the wisdom literature of the Old Testament, furthermore at the end of the first century in the Gospel of John, which however was written down in the Orient. This is not meant to deny that even the first beginnings of Christianity stood under the law of development in space and time, which accompanies all natural events in the universe but also the supernatural working of God. Christianity was certainly, regardless of the truths laid down in the sacred books, not a finished quantity at the moment of its origin. What then in Catholicism is supposed to be of distinctly Roman origin?

Perhaps the liturgy? We know from the research of the important Orientalist Bickell that in the Mass liturgy parts of the Passover rite of the post-exilic Jewish diaspora communities live on. But it is equally certain that an incursion of the Germanic-Frankish liturgy into the already Roman-formed liturgy occurred soon after Charlemagne, which brought in valuable components of Germanic custom that continue to live in the overall liturgy of the Roman Church to this day.

But beyond this, history and a glance at the liturgy of Western Roman Christianity tell us that in its forms Greek spirituality and Hellenistic mentality, Roman legal sensibility and the ancient sense for the great and moderately self-composed and a harmonious clarity live on, while the contributions of the Germanic North fertilized more individual areas from German national character.

Thus we encounter in the Roman liturgy the cooperation of cultural spheres that Roman formal sensibility knew how to unite in artistic formation. The Roman liturgy, which represents something that has become historical, is therefore a synthesis, without our being able therefore to speak of a syncretism in Christianity.

Let us take dogma! Racial theorists like Clauß speak within the human races of different stylistic types (achievement person [Nordic], perseverance person, redemption person [Mediterranean cultures], revelation person)—a classification whose justification is difficult to demonstrate, since we find similar characteristics in all races and peoples, even if not everywhere in equally strong expression. From this racial classification, however, it is claimed that the consciousness of sin, the redemption idea, a hierarchically formed priesthood, and the conceptions of the hereafter of Christianity penetrated into the Gospel by way of the racially allegedly decadent Mediterranean cultures that flourished in the Rome of the imperial period and displaced the ancient Roman culture; indeed, the Semitization of Christianity reaches back into the first century, for Paul infused the originally Aryan Christianity with Semitic-Talmudic spirit.

It is hardly worthwhile to take these historical constructions, which, like all racial doctrine, are not of German but of French origin, too seriously. How do the disciples of Renan and of David Friedrich Strauß explain the fact that of all the apostles Paul found the strongest opposition not among the pagans but in Judaism?

Has not precisely Paul, the mixed-blood from Hellenistic Tarsus, in a brilliant way first raised the racial problem in the Letter to the Romans and broken through the racial narrowness of the Jews of his time in the realm of the spirit? Is not for him Christianity that universal religious worldview that is able to unite the peoples of the earth over all differences of language and race, without the justified element naturally lying in language and race having to be extinguished or absorbed?

Incidentally, Lagarde and Chamberlain contradict themselves precisely in their position toward the personality of

Christ. Both proceed from the antisemitic standpoint but come to different results in their judgment.

The beginnings of Christianity do not stand in the darkness of myth or in the twilight of legend but in the full light of history. They also demand nothing from the modern person other than objectivity in thinking, a sober judgment, and the freeing of oneself from fantasies that have nothing in common with serious science. No less problematic than the dispute over the significance of the Apostle Paul in Christianity is the assumption that only the oriental person knows the redemption idea, while the Nordic race possesses only a world- and life-affirming and combatively shaping religion of reality.

From comparative religious history we know that the longing for redemption and the idea of sin, these essential foundations with which Christianity stands and falls, are by no means Semitic conceptions but are also proper to the Aryan religions of India and far beyond to almost all peoples. The prayers and religious rites of the Greeks and ancient Germans undoubtedly also had their foundation in the need for atonement and liberation from human guilt. Is there not a mystery cult of the Greeks independent of Semitic influences?

Another claim needs no refutation: that the idea of priesthood was first forced into the Gospel from the oriental cultural sphere and hierarchically developed in Rome. Peoples without priesthood do not belong to high cultures. For even the seers and seeresses among Greeks and Germans aimed at priestly functions, even if from the priestly ministrations no collegial exclusive priestly class could initially develop. Whoever knows the richly formed organization of the Old Testament priesthood as well as that of Egypt and Babylon will consider no special suggestions from Rome necessary in this regard.

That individual religious thoughts of the Gospel had to receive a sharply outlined formulation in the course of centuries in relation to currents of the time by which Christianity was threatened was a natural necessity. This dogma-historical development of Christianity, however, did not take place in its origin in the West, thus not within the Roman Church, but in the East, where the first great controversies of Christianity with the religious-philosophical currents of Greek antiquity occurred. The great theologians of the first centuries were of Greek nationality and, insofar as they belonged to the Roman cultural sphere, stood under the influence of the Greeks. Let us think of Ambrose, who is dependent on Origen and the Alexandrian theological school, which influenced almost all Greek Fathers up to John of Damascus, with whom the oriental world experienced a certain theological conclusion. Let us think of Hilary of Poitiers, of Victorinus, who in the fourth century composed the first Bible commentary in the Latin language, while until then Greek predominated scientifically. If we go further up, the great theologians who influenced the further development of Christianity in antiquity are mainly North Africans. The African Church also took a magnificent share within the entire Church in the legal realm. Augustine, the creator of Western theology, who influenced the philosophy, dogmatics, and constitutional law of the Middle Ages equally deeply and in a leading way, was Roman by his father, but of Phoenician origin by his mother. Jerome was an Illyrian. The first actual pure-blooded Roman, whose literary activity influenced less the formation of dogma than the liturgy, was Gregory the Great in the sixth century. Still later was Thomas Aquinas, upon whose writings Western theology continues to build to this day, related to the ruling family of the Hohenstaufen. Precisely in him are, so to speak, two natures, the Mediterranean and Nordic, merged in a magnificent unity. He was German and Roman, Germanic and

Romanic in one person. He wrote in medieval Germanic transformed lines and directed his philosophical polemic against the Arabic-Semitic Enlightenment philosophy of that time, which began to obscure the Christianized West like a second Gnosticism. He received his deeper formation not in Naples and Orvieto but in Paris and Cologne, where again a German, the Swabian Albertus Magnus from Lauingen, was his teacher.

Considered racially, the surprising determination emerges that the most significant personalities from whom the strongest impulses for the further development of Western Christianity in the first and decisive centuries proceeded were not pure but mixed-race at all. We have quite similar phenomena in the realm of the secular culture of antiquity. Perhaps it would not be too difficult to confirm this thought from other cultures as well. How many personalities of Germanic race were furthermore involved in the further development of Christian theology after the works of patristics and antiquity were transmitted to the Germanic genius from the British Isles. It suffices here to recall men like Bede the Venerable, Alcuin, Rabanus Maurus, and Walahfrid Strabo. In the cathedral and monastic schools of Fulda, Reichenau, and St. Gallen there prevailed a scientific activity that could compete in significance with the schools of Tours, Orleans, Reims, and Chartres. In all centuries we find in Western Christianity a collaboration of races and nations, for only in this way could a universal Church unfold despite many oppositions within human groups.

If we consider with a few sentences the later development of the Roman Church from the viewpoint of the national and racial origin of its leading personalities, we see that for the Council of Trent, whose influences reach into the present and whose intellectual pioneer was the last non-Italian Pope Hadrian VI, alongside the Spanish theologians and the Italian Charles Borromeo, again a

German, Peter Canisius, exercised a decisive influence. Magnificent are the achievements of German theology in the realm of moral theology and canon law in the eighteenth century. If German Catholicism in the nineteenth century was leading especially in historical science, it stood a century earlier second to no other nation in other Catholic branches of knowledge. How valuable scientifically would be, in contrast to the claims presented today as infallible by some radical racial teachers who see in Catholicism only a Romance cultural sphere and an "Italian national church," a history of Catholic theology organized according to races, nations, and tribes, as we already possess such a history of secular literature. If we consider the age of the Reformation, the Baroque, Romanticism, and reawakening Catholicism from this viewpoint, then without doubt the German nation stands leading with its scientific work in the entire Church, with a wealth of deep thoughts and an abundance of suggestions that has not been surpassed by any nation through the coexistence and constant controversies with other Christian confessions. Universal ecclesiastical and national thinking and research have often met in all centuries of our German people in a wonderful harmony and wide-ranging intellectual horizons.

Does the organization of Western Christianity show influences of Roman or allegedly decadent Mediterranean cultures? The primacy of an apostle and apostolic succession in the episcopate appear in the Bible as of divine origin, which therefore also may not be judged merely from the standpoint of historical development. A completely different question, however, is to what extent the development of the hierarchical organization according to metropolitan federations and dioceses has become precisely historical. No one denies that the Roman political provincial division could not remain without influence on the hierarchical structuring of the universal Church, but the great basic lines of organization were

long previously given in the post-exilic Jewish diaspora communities of the East. The organization of the Church is rather in its essential components of apostolic origin. Therefore the development of the hierarchy by Rome no longer changed Christianity in its essence. Ultimately everything comes down to the question: Is the primacy of Rome, this most important hierarchical institution of world history, originated from the Romance cultural sphere, thus only the continuation of the world-historical imperium in religious forms? We thereby come into one of the most difficult and, by the racial researchers who transfer the entire problem to religious culture, most disputed areas.

It is, however, gratifying that in our days also in Protestant scholarly circles the church-historical and biblical assessment of the Chair of Peter in the sense of the well-known text in Matthew (16:17-19) is increasingly approaching that of the Catholic Church.

The radical representatives of racial science further claim that in Rome under Etruscan influence a fanciful doctrine of the hereafter penetrated into Christianity. Precisely in this area, however, the dogma-historical further development of Christianity made no essential progress into the Middle Ages beyond the biblical conception. Whoever, incidentally, compares the world of the hereafter of the Etruscans with that of Babylon and Egypt will determine surprising connections and similarities, but also observe the fact that Christianity, including the books of the Old Testament, is far removed from the fanciful doctrine of the hereafter of the named peoples. Christianity has above all completely denied the purely hedonistic formation of the hereafter of the Etruscans and Greeks. In Christianity the world beyond is also essentially spiritual.

Something completely different, however, is the question whether components of Etruscan conceptions of the hereafter could maintain themselves for a longer time as ordinary popular belief in

the already Christianized world city of Rome. Undoubtedly many horror-inducing images in Dante's "Divine Comedy" are influenced by these Etruscan ideas of the hereafter. To answer this is a matter of comparative folklore; in any case, even with an affirmative answer, the essence of Christianity would not be affected. How many festivals of the Roman and ancient Germanic cultural sphere still live on in Christianity today, but no one will therefore say that these constitute or disturb the essence of the Christian religion. Their disappearance would affect the latter just as little as their existence has a disturbing effect, for they have entered into a wonderful synthesis and union with Christianity.

Catholicism is therefore not the religious expression of the Roman genius, of the Romance peoples, and of the, racially speaking, decadent Mediterranean cultures. Other peoples and races have also contributed to the further development of Christianity. Greeks and Germans have brought valuable elements from the rich treasures of their spirit.

What then was the religious task of Rome and thus of the "Romance" cultural sphere? Rome's influence on the development of Christianity lay, in relation to the restless Germanic and Nordic soul, in the preservation of the deposit of faith of the early Church against the attacks of all centuries and in the missionary work of the Gospel. The attacks often came from other cultural and racial spheres (Arianism—Pelagianism—Reformation), but Rome always found the clear formulation of concepts and preservation from all radical excesses of religiosity. Rome has proven its great ability in all centuries, and this is ancient Roman characteristic, to have a balancing effect.

Indeed, we can say that without Rome the faith in Christ's divinity and thereby in the supernatural character of Christianity

would have long since perished in the intellectual struggles of the centuries among many separated confessions.

The final conclusions from the preceding thoughts, which wished to give only in broad outlines a section from the problem: Rome, Western Christianity, and the racial question, are the following:

1. In times of great controversies and still greater unclarity of concepts and words, only he serves history, his people, and fatherland best who musters the courage to think conservatively within certain limits, to preserve the freedom of his scientific conviction, and to resist the current. Let us therefore guard ourselves from working with catchwords in such a difficult area as the racial question is. It is not scientifically tenable to designate certain races in advance as corrosive, others as culture-forming, or to present racially mixed areas in advance as suited for corrosion. Every race has advantages and defects. Only upon harmonious cooperation is the true progress of mankind built.

In evaluating racial differences for cultural life, we must also note that among civilized peoples there are almost no more pure, unmixed races. The numerous wars, the migration of peoples, the constant flowing off of ordinary population layers from the countryside into the large cities, the freedom of movement with which especially in the present families can change their residences, all this speaks against it. It furthermore seems to prove true that the native soil for high cultures is racially already mixed geographical spaces, while mono-raciality or racial purity leads to spiritual desiccation, just as in the economic realm self-sufficiency hinders all progress.

The excellent authority on Roman history, Edward Gibbon, was able to determine in this regard in his work "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" (p. 33): "The restricted policy of

preserving the pure blood of the ancient citizens without foreign admixture has hindered the fortune of Athens and Sparta and hastened their downfall." This is not meant to claim that high cultures can only be the consequence of racial mixtures or that racial mixture is the indispensable prerequisite for the emergence of genius.

2. Precisely the example of Rome, where on the soil of racial mixture of numerous peoples, thanks to the thoroughly predominant ancient Romans, a wonderful Christian high culture blossomed while the political world empire of the Caesars sank, teaches us that the purely biological explanation of races, which are not something rigid, must fail if the undeniably great role of the purely spiritual is not also brought in. Cultures are also co-formed by blood and race, climate and soil, but primarily by the spiritual, which has its own laws that we can only observe in laborious research, because nothing is so infinitely manifold as the working of the spirit among peoples. Whoever therefore overemphasizes the racial idea comes not only to the rejection of the universal Church as the bearer of a synthesis of cultures and a universal supranational Christianity, but beyond that to the rejection of Christianity altogether and, when racial doctrine is developed into radical antisemitism, to the separation of the Old Testament from the New.

Whoever sees in race the sole culture-forming principle must logically reject Christianity because its first bearers belonged to a foreign race; in other words, we sink back into the numerous national religions of antiquity that were to be overcome by Christianity in the sense of a unified worldview. New boundary stones are set between races and peoples; thereby only the dangerousness of an over emphasis of the racial question is pointed out, by no means however the self-protection of races within certain limits denied. Thus the racial idea in that overemphasized form in which some today represent it in opposition to the political program

of National Socialism is not only a struggle against Rome and Christianity but against every universal idea of God. The overestimation of physical elements and the biological has in history always ended with materialism.

We can go still further in the rejection of various conclusions that today in connection with the racial soul doctrine are simply presupposed like infallible results of science. Particularly disputed is the claim that cultural decline must always be the necessary consequence of racial corrosion; it can be the consequence or at least the co-consequence, but it need not always be. Precisely the ancient history of Greece, Rome, Egypt, and Babylon proves to us that cultural golden periods by no means must fall in the time of alleged racial purity, indeed that these states precisely in the greatest moments of their history were no longer nation-states or possessed pure-blooded human material.

Let us take the age of Augustus in Rome! Equally clear is the further fact that every culture builds upon the achievements of a preceding one. There are no isolated cultures. The Greek did not come about suddenly but presupposes centuries of other cultures. The entire ancient culture is unthinkable without the East. That of the North also, whether we reckon in centuries or millennia, did not come about by itself from forest solitude or from the blood of men, but grew organically from other values. All peoples contribute to the attainment of high culture. In religious culture it is similar, for Christianity also presupposes nature, does not destroy it, but completes it. We therefore find parallels to Christianity, similar religious forms and thoughts among many other peoples, in the most diverse cultural spheres; however, this fact proves nothing against Christianity but tells us only that Christianity has absorbed the deepest religious needs of the human soul, that the soul of man is Christian by nature. There exists, as Clement of Alexandria so

profoundly says, a seed-bearing word among all peoples, for Christ was the light of the world long before he himself walked among men. "Before Abraham was, I am." He surrounded with his radiance the peaks of ancient intellectual history and shone into Jewish, Indian, and Greek culture, guarding, cultivating, and unfolding what they had of positive religious values.

The struggle for Rome precisely from radical racial doctrine therefore becomes comprehensible to anyone who considers and judges the development of mankind from a higher vantage point in terms of the history of ideas. Rome embodies the idea of the unity of Christianity, the unity of the human race across all races and nations.

The nineteenth century brought us the purely materialistic historical explanation, which first saw in the events of peoples only a soulless becoming and passing away (Schopenhauer), later wanted to explain everything from social class struggles in the sense of Marxism (Bebel, Kautsky). Today everything flees, to avoid ultimate decisions, with Georges Sorel behind the myth of race and blood. Have we not actually landed again in the monism of Haeckel?

3. According to Christian worldview, unconditional superordination and primacy belong not to blood but to spirit. Where human will shows weaknesses and inhibitions, the deepest root lies, however much climate, landscape, and race may also play a part, in a spiritual sphere, in original sin and not in blood. Therefore race can never alone and in itself be elevated to a moral concept of value, without our wishing to deny that the individual races distinguish themselves through certain dispositions peculiar only to them. The hereditary stream can create important preconditions for the intellectual-moral person but can never establish him. The essence of man is determined not only biologically by eternal natural laws but also by the spirit, if we do not finally wish to arrive at the denial of freedom of the will. The task of science is to investigate to

what extent climate, landscape, environment, and blood co-form and shape the intellectual-moral attitude of a nation. But whoever wishes to write a history of nations determined by blood and race is no less a materialist than the disciples of Marxism when they wish to explain the development of peoples only according to economic and class-determined oppositions.

Toward radical expressions of the racial idea, only liberation from materialism helps, because intellectual life is more than a scientific description of dissection series and types; only the freeing of criticism helps, to reject excesses and follies of fantasy that otherwise would also bury under themselves the great and future-pointing element for spirit and science that lies in various thoughts of modern racial science. The importing of the racial into the essence of Christianity, however, leads with compelling necessity to the abandonment of the absolute, to becoming stuck in the natural, to the loss of all unconditional values, to the relativism of knowledge and morality.

4. Christianity does not in itself signify a culture alongside cultures and does not create directly from itself a special culture, but can unite itself with every cultural sphere that does not deny the foundations of the perennial philosophy, in order to breathe into it from the high ethos of its religious world certain fundamental ideas. Christianity, however, preserves human culture from a complete sinking into a philosophy of this world.

We must therefore guard ourselves from coordinating Christianity with a particular culture, as if Catholicism were the Latin form of Christianity or Roman culture more than a historical and certainly also providential accompanying phenomenon of Western Christianity in individual forms of its expression. Catholicism did not signify Romanization or predominance of the Latin cultural world. Whoever adheres to such a conception harms

the universal Church just as much as those hypernational circles of Fascism according to which only Roman culture and organization elevated Christianity from the ghetto of a race-bound Jewish sect of Palestine to the dominant position of a world religion. Let us still ask ourselves:

5. In what does the German peculiarity in religious thinking consist at all? Does the Germanic person actually have a different religious and moral feeling that was only, so to speak, alienated and covered by Mediterranean, oriental, and Roman elements? In which writers before the Reformation does it come most clearly to expression, after Meister Eckhart can hardly be made the trustee of modern religious German currents? In this question too, much dispassionate objectivity is required to distinguish the true from the false, fantasy and reality. Even if one sees the characteristic for the religious manner of the Germanic person in a certain self-willed subjective attitude toward external authority, the essence of German humanity can hardly be reduced to a fixed formula. The Germanic person shares too much in intellectual realms with other peoples. In any case, it would be wrong to claim that the German person first found the religiously congenial form of expression with Luther. The Reformation in its beginnings was only a theological dispute that did not touch the Germanic national soul at all. Only the territorial princes politically misused this religious revolt of the North against Rome for their selfish goals. Or do we wish to strike seven centuries from German history and deprive numerous leading figures of the Middle Ages, who were deeply Catholic and national, of their national significance? Nothing would be more aberrant than, for example, a certain coordination of pantheistic religious conception, whose representatives we find among all races and nations, with the religious genius of the Germanic people. It is also aberrant when, for example, Chamberlain thinks the Germanic peoples are always in

religious respects for tolerance, while the Semitic race thinks only materialistically without metaphysical capabilities! How then does one explain the Saxon wars, which were not only political but also religious wars? Whence came then the wealth of medieval philosophy in the schools of Cologne, Fulda, and St. Gallen, which were influenced to no small extent by the Arabic-Jewish intellectual currents of that time?

6. Many researchers of our days who build their claims only upon the racial idea see an essential opposition between national sentiment and that universal stamp that Christianity has found precisely in Catholicism. Love for one's own national character, its history and future, is supposed to be irreconcilable with the Catholic worldview. They often speak positively of a dying off of national feeling in the atmosphere of Catholic religious life. Undoubtedly Catholicism and the idea of humanity in the sense of ancient humanitas and far beyond it are closely connected. Everything truly Catholic is a constant inhibition against radicalisms, in whatever realms they may also occur, unites the people and peoples who today have nothing more in common with one another than belonging to the same genius, in the consciousness of a higher spiritual connectedness. However, this by no means says that in Catholicism all races must simply be leveled and everything national simply suppressed. Even within the essential foundations of Christianity common to all, every people and every race will retain and ennoble the good that is racially peculiar, for grace also presupposes nature and does not eliminate it but only perfects it. The Germanic person remains Germanic even in Catholicism, the Greek a Greek, the Semite a Semite, the Aryan an Aryan; otherwise Christianity would be equivalent to the destruction of national character and the biological values and hereditary laws laid by God himself into nature.

Ecclesiastical life is therefore nothing bloodless or cosmopolitically international but expresses itself in the concrete givenness of a nationally conditioned community, a national character. The Church is therefore in its self-realization somehow necessarily bound to the nature of the people it confronts. Thus there will always be a difference in how the same ecclesiastical life realizes itself among the Greeks, Romans, Germans, Slavs, or East Asians. If one asks from this standpoint about the share of Germanic peoples in world Catholicism, it lies in the activism that was carried into Christianity and thereby into the universal Church by the Nordic peoples. As valuable as the formation of religious concepts and the emphasis on law in the organization of a universal Church must be, the possibility and danger of stagnation was in many epochs of church history perhaps also prevented by the restless Nordic soul oriented toward problems, which constantly urged toward reform, toward interiorization and stronger moral sense of responsibility and toward deepening, in order to remain fruitful. It lies in the essence of a world religion that in it all races and peoples work together harmoniously and therefore are equally entitled and equally obligated.

Perhaps the Eastern Church separated from Rome has lacked precisely such an element; otherwise the tranquility that has entered into individual national churches and also the isolation of oriental Christianity toward the cultural ideas of state and national history would hardly be understandable.

But let us not forget in all these thoughts and suggestions that Christianity is essentially supernatural, that is, revelation, faith. It may therefore not, when one poses the question how far the national and racially conditioned hereditary possession of peoples was drawn upon in its further development, be simply coordinated and treated equally with natural religions. It was one of the great

errors of the past that the overloading with comparative religious and national history has stifled the sense for the essence of Christianity as supernatural religion. Thus are explained many skewed judgments about Christianity and about the natural religions of ancient, not yet Hinduized India and Greece, insofar as it had not yet absorbed Near Eastern influences (cf. the writings of Otto, Kynest, Günther), and of the ancient Germans (Kummer, Grönbach). We certainly stand partly before questions and problems that did not occupy and interest the past to the degree they do our present. Only through numerous individual investigations could it be determined how one can speak of a human element in the formation of Christianity, in legal questions, shaping of concepts, formulations, modes of expression, without degrading Christianity from the rank of revelation to an ordinary philosophy of life.

Theological science can show through individual research how the races and peoples, in whom according to Clement of Alexandria the Word was already active before Christ's coming, have contributed to the further development of Christianity, but it should not be overlooked that Christianity is no syncretism of religions and faith and knowledge are not to be coordinated. Perhaps Christian apologetics of the last decades in its zeal to defend Christianity against modern attacks has overemphasized much and thought to deepen the foundations of Christian religion through one-sided proofs of reason and analogical conclusions. Faith is not knowledge alone but ultimately a work of humility and grace of the bowing understanding and will where strictly mathematical proofs must fail. Thus this small excerpt from the religious history of Europe, considered and judged by the racial idea, already shows how many dangers for Christianity are connected with the radicalization of this idea.

6. STERILIZATION & EUGENICS.

The dogmatic edifice of National Socialism rests upon two concepts: nation and race. From both foundations, which are closely interrelated, there emerge—as soon as they are thought through consistently—important practical demands of uncompromising clarity. The overemphasis on the concepts of race and hereditary substance harbors within itself the danger of a distancing from Christianity for the Germanic people, because this religion originated from foreign races and cultural spheres. On the hygienic-social level, however, there appears as a consequence the elimination of the hereditarily diseased mass through marriage prohibitions and sterilization. If one does not give the concepts of nation and race a narrower interpretation, it is difficult to avoid these two conclusions. With complete clarity, therefore, the demand for sterilization appears throughout the entire leading National Socialist literature as a self-evident matter, for which the radical representatives would prefer not to admit any further justification or evaluation from the realm of morality. In this sense Alfred Rosenberg declared on December 14, 1934 in Hamburg:

"Every great turning point in world history does not take its departure from military powers, but from worldview. Ideological missions determine the destiny of peoples. With the year 1920 came an ideological and political turning point in the life of nations, such as occurs only every half or full millennium. National Socialism brought a new attempt at self-awareness. It brought the discovery of the unity of body and soul, which will determine not only philosophical but also state and economic life. It is not a matter of recognizing certain dogmas, but rather of the fruitfulness of German life. If there are still people today who argue about the value of

sterilization, they do not comprehend that without sterilization in a few centuries there will be one idiot for every two Germans, that all cultural treasures will thereby be destroyed. We can no longer permit a dispute today about whether sterilization is Christian or un-Christian. The old powers will also have to come to terms with racial science and with the deep connections between body and soul. The old powers will come to terms with many things. They will later make them their own, just as the Christian Church once made the formerly combated pagan cross its symbol."

In the question of sterilization and eugenics it is certainly not a matter of things that National Socialism discovered or made the subject of scientific and daily political controversies. Decades earlier we encounter similar efforts, which soon led to legislative measures in various states. The classical land of racial-eugenic efforts is England as well as the entire Nordic cultural sphere including North America with its Protestant majority. However, the motives in some states are more punitive measures and less of a eugenic nature.

The German Society for Racial Hygiene, whose co-founder is Alfred Ploetz, expressed itself as late as 1922 to the effect that the time had not yet come for compulsory sterilization of the mentally inferior and otherwise degenerate in Germany, but that the sterilization of pathologically predisposed persons at their own request or with their consent should soon be legally regulated. The National Socialist deputy Dr. Boeters not only demanded in October 1925 in his legislative draft directed to the Reichstag "Lex Zwickau" the sterilization of the hereditarily inferior, but also had a larger number of sterilizations performed on his own responsibility based on racial-hygienic indications.

Thus already before 1933 in Germany, since individual medical circles and socialist deputies ensured the popularization of these ideas, a legislative draft had long been ready, which however

went far beyond similar ones in other states and did not come to a vote due to resistance from Christian circles. Perhaps this tendency toward racial-eugenic legislation was also strengthened by the uncertain position of individual Catholic theologians in Germany and North America, which also found expression in the following polemic of the well-known newspaper "Germania" against the pastoral letter of the Austrian bishops from the year 1933:

"The un-Christian sterilization law is to be addressed not as a principle but as a legislative measure of the national government of Germany, whose tendency is also approved by Catholic theologians. Admittedly this measure has in one point given occasion for representations by the ecclesiastical organs to the Reich government, but in the implementing regulations certain accommodations were immediately granted in response. On both the state and ecclesiastical sides there exists the sincere will to reach a peaceful understanding concerning this and other differences."

"The Church will review its position as to whether the opinion it has hitherto represented, that sterilization contradicts Christian and natural ethics, is valid, and will adopt the idea that eugenic sterilization can be regarded as a medical action on the body of the people and also on the soul of the people, and can then be recognized as an act of charity."

For National Socialism, however, it is not merely a matter of a legislative measure, but rather of the realization of a demand that emerges with innermost necessity from the racial dogma. It is the world of ideas of Gobineau, Nietzsche, and Chamberlain concerning the worthlessness of hereditarily diseased life that is being carried into legislation. It suffices to bring a few remarks from the history of these sterilization efforts, which have already seized numerous states, since anyone who seeks deeper insights into this equally difficult and

controversial moral and medical territory must study the leading literature thoroughly in order to obtain an objective judgment.

Besides America, the Swiss canton of Vaud, and Germany, a larger number of European states have put such laws into force. Sterilization laws exist today, in addition to the countries just mentioned, in Finland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Estonia. Legislative drafts are pending in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Japan, Yugoslavia, Romania, New Zealand, and in the Baltic states.

In approximately one-third of modern states, therefore, sterilization for the mentally ill and habitual criminals is already mandatory law. By contrast, the Latin cultural sphere with predominantly Catholic population has thus far taken a rejecting position (Italy, France, Spain, and also Austria).

In the North American Union there are no fewer than 23 states that have already introduced sterilization by law for some time. It may be performed on criminals, the insane, the feeble-minded, the morally degenerate, sexually perverse persons, kidnappers, drunkards, epileptics, syphilitics, etc. The execution of the operation is to be supervised by a specially appointed board consisting of state-appointed physicians. In Canada in 1928 the province of Alberta passed a law for the sterilization of the mentally ill. It provides for the sterilization of those persons who, although they are not yet cured or are incurable, are to be released from insane asylums for some reason. Sterilization may only be performed when the patient, insofar as he is capable of doing so, himself gives his consent or when the consent of the spouse, the possible guardian, or some other close relative is present. The supervision of the operation also lies here with a special medical council. In Switzerland it is the canton of Vaud that likewise passed a sterilization law in 1928. The mentally weak and mentally ill whose disease is recognized as incurable and of whom it can be established according to human foresight that their

offspring would be hereditarily burdened are declared sterilizable. The health council of the canton may grant authorization for sterilization only after obtaining concurring expert opinions from two physicians.

In Denmark there has existed since 1920 a law exclusively for sex offenders, which was incorporated into the civil criminal code as an addendum in 1930. Of all the Nordic countries, Denmark goes furthest with its sterilization law of 1931. Norway has had such a law since 1934; in Sweden it is still under advisement. The leading basic ideas of this legislation are: security in place of punishment for hereditarily burdened persons and the new construction of the state on a biological foundation, displacement of uninhibited individualism through a new concept of the family that is built upon the laws of heredity and determined by consideration for the national community, in order to sharpen the biological sense of responsibility of the people. International congresses (New York 1932) and an international program committee (Brussels 1922) ensure the further dissemination of this idea. At the head of the International Federation stands the well-known racial hygienist of Germany, Ernst Rüdin, who also wrote the explanatory notes to the German Reich law.

In almost all Nordic countries the program is characterized by the following things: premarital health certificates before marriage, selective internal settlement policy (home ownership, small farmer settlement) with the selection of the most viable people, family policy (raising numerous offspring), alcohol legislation, eradication of venereal diseases, isolation of certain criminals. Particular reference is made in justification to the high fertility in the predominantly Slavic and Romance states—apart from France—compared to the sharply declined fertility in the Germanic states (weakest are Austria, England, and Sweden).

It is noteworthy that the Romance cultural sphere has thus far remained aloof from these efforts. At the Eleventh International Congress for Criminal Law and Prison Administration, which took place in Berlin in August 1935, the reporter on questions of castration and sterilization was the Swiss Professor Naville.

In the third section, which dealt with the problems of prevention, the question of castration of sex offenders and the sterilization of psychopaths from whom only inferior offspring inclined to crime would be expected stood in the foreground of the proceedings. The skill of the chairman Delaquis and the reporter Naville succeeded in finding a mediating formula that was adopted unanimously in the section and with an overwhelming majority in the plenary session. It recommends both mentioned measures, namely both at the request of the persons to be operated on and also by compulsion, the latter however only after conducting a proper procedure that guarantees a thorough examination of the preconditions by a board consisting of physicians and jurists.

The essential content of the German Law for the Prevention of Hereditarily Diseased Offspring with legal effect from January 1, 1934 (Reich Law Gazette No. 86 of July 25, 1933, Part I) mandates the compulsory sterilization of certain hereditarily diseased persons by means of a surgical intervention under three conditions:

1. When according to the experience of medical science it is to be expected with great probability that the offspring will suffer from severe physical or mental hereditary defects. 2. When a corresponding application is submitted in writing either by the person concerned himself or, in case of his diminished legal capacity, by his legal representative, or also by the public health officer, or finally with regard to the inmates of hospitals, sanitariums, nursing homes, or penal institutions by the institution director. 3. When the official Hereditary Health Court has decided positively on this

application. Further provisions of this law, which comprises 18 paragraphs, regulate details and are to enable its implementation. An official commentary and the explanations of Ministerial Director Dr. Gütt in a press conference at the Reich Propaganda Ministry on January 8, 1934 provide further supplements. The essential ideas are the following:

1. Sterilization is only permissible when the disease is established beyond medical doubt and 2. the Hereditary Health Court arrives at the result after free evaluation of evidence that the offspring will with great probability be hereditarily diseased.

The following is designated as the moral foundation of such a decision:

"In the future hereditarily diseased offspring shall no longer come into being, the family shall be preserved from infinite suffering, the general public from new burdens. Insofar as this goal is achievable by other means, the lawgiver does not consider the application of the intervention absolutely necessary. Therefore persons who in any case must be kept permanently in institutions are not to be sterilized, just as it appears unobjectionable to refrain from interventions when hereditarily diseased persons voluntarily allow themselves to be kept in an institution. When danger to life exists, the intervention may be omitted.

Fundamentally the provisions of voluntary jurisdiction apply to the proceedings before the Hereditary Health Court. Provisions have been created to exclude every misstep. Particularly to be emphasized is that the overall judgment is always to be made only according to objective medical principles and according to the experience of medical science. The public health officers and courts will have to treat cases according to their urgency. Thus it would not be sensible, for example, to sterilize institution inmates immediately now who will perhaps only be released from the institution in a year,

or to begin with schoolchildren in whom the danger of producing hereditarily diseased offspring is not to be feared."

The Reich German sterilization law names eight groups of diseases (schizophrenia, epilepsy, hereditary blindness, hereditary deafness, etc.) whose carriers are to be made infertile by the institution physicians. Through the Reich law of October 18, 1935 (Law for the Protection of the Hereditary Health of the German People) the catalog of marriage prohibition grounds increases to eleven items. The new law, which is a further continuation of the eugenic idea, introduces for all engaged couples the compulsion to present themselves at the health offices for medical examination. The certificate of marriage fitness is refused in the following cases:

1. When one of the engaged persons suffers from a disease connected with danger of contagion that allows one to fear considerable damage to the health of the other party or of the offspring.

2. When one of the engaged persons is under guardianship or stands under provisional guardianship.

3. When one of the engaged persons, without being under guardianship, suffers from a mental disturbance that makes the marriage appear undesirable for the national community.

4. When one of the engaged persons suffers from a hereditary disease within the meaning of the Law for the Prevention of Hereditarily Diseased Offspring.

Noteworthy is the provision according to which entering into a marriage is not permitted despite sterilization having occurred, because the lawgiver, who has in view the increase of population, does not want to allow a healthy marriage partner to remain childless. The inclusion of mental disturbances appears problematic (thus not only actual mental illnesses, which are already mentioned in the sterilization law, but also neuroses, depressions, etc.), which

are difficult to diagnose conclusively during the summary examination by the public health officers.

In the penal provisions of the law, fraudulently obtaining a prohibited marriage or the attempt to do so is threatened with imprisonment from three months to five years. When both engaged persons or the bridegroom are foreigners, the law finds no application. By contrast, foreign women who wish to marry a German must submit to the medical examination. They also fall under the penal provisions if they make false statements about their state of health or attempt other deceptions; however, criminal prosecution occurs only upon special order, which the Reich Minister of the Interior issues in agreement with the Reich Minister of Justice. Marriages that are concluded abroad to circumvent the new Reich law are null and void.

Much has contributed to these laws: the general moral decline phenomena since the World War (statistics of live and stillbirths), the destruction of germinating life, economic distress of families with many children, the great numerically established increase of mental illnesses in recent decades, decrease of births simultaneously with the increase of the unemployed, and the inadequate housing conditions. The monstrous word of Lindsey, that rubber has revolutionized morality, is not without justification. National Socialism considers these questions partly from the financial standpoint, partly from the biological world of ideas, in which the inferior and hereditarily diseased have no right to reproduce. Many adherents see in this legislation the salvation of Germany from decline. According to an estimate by Grotjahn, in Germany approximately 20 million are to be designated as undesirable for reproduction. As main reasons the eugenic movement names:

1. The statistically indisputable fact that the inferior part of peoples reproduces itself maritally and extramaritally in greater numbers compared to the high-quality.

2. The purpose of reproduction must be a qualitative population policy and not merely a quantitative one.

3. Eugenic-biological modern research regards family, nationality, and individual personality according to viewpoints that were completely inaccessible to earlier times. Medicine hitherto treated the individual. Since biology has recognized the individual person as a function of a life-line and a life-whole, the art of healing has turned beyond the healing of the individual to that of an entire life-line. The Church has accomplished the transformation from the Ptolemaic to the Copernican worldview, so it will also participate in that from individual medicine to hereditary-biological medicine. Precisely the latter opens up new areas and forms of caring love.

4. While many hereditarily capable persons, motivated by selfishness or by economic need, voluntarily renounce offspring, the state must bear enormous burdens from the tax monies of the hereditarily capable for the nursing homes, prisons, and welfare enterprises filled with the hereditarily inferior.

The resistance against these eugenic efforts of National Socialism comes not from Protestant circles, but from the Catholic side. Also in the other states there was only in Norway a Protestant counter-movement that expressed its moral concerns. The Germanic, overwhelmingly Protestant cultural sphere is already completely dominated by eugenic-racial efforts. Here appears the remarkable fact that today, as in Luther's time, Protestantism religiously adheres to individualism with rejection of any stronger ecclesiastical community idea, but on the social level thinks thoroughly collectively with almost complete elimination of an individual culture and cultivation of personality. With the principle "common benefit

precedes self-interest" the Protestant moral teaching adapts itself to conditions in which the community idea claims an unconditional predominance. Catholic morality seeks a golden mean between the two demands of an individualistic and collectivistic culture. It is understandable that it thereby automatically comes into difficulties with movements that advance their ideas radically and reject compromises from the outset. This problem, which is a moral-religious and scientific-medical one, becomes all the more complicated because the standpoint of science has not yet been clarified in all questions and has not arrived at definitive final results, as the official explanations to the German Reich law best prove. Hereditary predisposition, which in various cases can at least be diminished through appropriate medical treatment, is probably to be separated from heredity. Thus two views stand opposed here, both of which claim dogmatic character. In the final analysis it is a struggle between the freedom of the personality and an exaggerated concept of community. An understanding on a middle line therefore appears difficult for the knowledgeable observer of both standpoints, as much as it would be desirable, since two essentially different contemplations of life stand opposed: the biological and the religious-natural law. However, certain accommodations could come into question for hospitals that are in the possession of Catholic orders, associations, and federations, through a more lenient interpretation on the part of the state of individual paragraphs, in order to avoid active cooperation by sisters, Catholic conviction-faithful physicians, guardians, and judges at the Hereditary Health Courts and in the implementation of the laws when these would have to contradict the religious conscience of the individual. Practically decisive would be the general principles of Christian morality and the possibility of cooperation in actions forbidden per se from the Christian standpoint (material and formal cooperation).

A further difficulty is formed by the fact that the Church permits marriages of sterilized persons (they are not to be prevented), but the state forbids them.

If one wishes to judge these eugenic efforts correctly in their development, one must above all not overlook that Marxist rule has meant a complete moral collapse of Europe. It suffices here to recall the popular scientific lectures on contraception recommended and supported by this party, the establishment of clinics that occupied themselves with the recommendation of contraceptive means. The statistical reports for Germany and Austria are shocking with regard to racial composition, age structure, and the quality of those born. Only a positive eugenics with truly Christian-national thinking could create a remedy here. It is nothing other than the courage not merely to die for the fatherland, but also to live for it. Thereby hereditary-biological considerations would also necessarily have to be carried into charitable work. Not the number of children per se can be the decisive factor, but rather the expected quality. Life too requires an ordering through reason (rationalization of welfare expenditures, files on the inferior, facilitation of prognosis for hereditary pathologists, guardianship by official action, etc.).

The position of Catholicism on all these questions is set down in the marriage encyclical ("Casti Connubii") of Pope Pius XI of December 31, 1931 and in several decisions of the supreme papal congregation for matters of faith (Holy Office), especially that of March 21, 1931, in which the eugenic efforts with regard to marriage were condemned. Both wish to create no new law, but to defend natural law against modern state demands. The Catholic Church condemns any restriction of the right to marriage by secular powers; it defines this right as a natural right of man and thus as one that precedes any right of society. It teaches that burdened individuals should be advised against marriage and that education should teach

the value of sacrifice for the benefit of the common good; but it rejects every legal coercive measure: the secular powers can never, not even on the basis of a medical certificate, forbid a marriage. To define marriage impediments is the concern of the Church alone. The state can impose marriage prohibitions for military officers and employees under certain conditions, but not impediments in the proper sense.

Castration and sterilization are therefore impermissible violations of the body, to which no human being may give permission. The Catholic Church wants no compromise in these questions and points to the great danger that one will very quickly find the way from the medical and eugenic indication to the social one, in other words to a lax attitude toward life. It forbids all measures that could be suitable for reducing the birth rate, thus also all contraceptive means. This consistent position is set forth in the encyclical "Casti Connubii." For the Catholic neither compulsory nor voluntary sterilization comes into consideration, therefore no Catholic can with a clear conscience submit the application for sterilization. The encyclical leaves open a single possibility for limiting the birth rate: voluntary abstinence practiced in mutual agreement.

Papal general circular letters are admittedly not cathedral decisions in the strict theological sense, but as proclamations of the supreme ecclesiastical authority, since they wish to take a position on significant questions of contemporary history, they oblige every Catholic in conscience.

The Church does not reject the serious, scientific efforts of medicine and racial research for the development of a healthy people, but it condemns that eugenics which abandons the distinction between body and soul and attributes to itself an unconditional autonomy, a moral primacy in the sense of Kant's philosophy. A national anthropology and population policy that works together

with hereditary care and racial hygiene is therefore thoroughly to be welcomed, as long as the spiritual factors are not overlooked and in the zeal for race and people a naturalism is not introduced that should be eliminated precisely from national life.

The justification for the rejection of sterilization can certainly not be taken only from Thomas Aquinas, in whose biology, which goes back to the Aristotelian concept of nature (epigenesis, vitalism), the rules of heredity and the modern eugenic formulation of questions were not yet possible. The proofs must therefore be taken primarily from natural law, for the Church also does not deny that in reproduction quantity and quality together must be the ideal goal, but not one alone. Furthermore, the concepts personal freedom of the citizen, guilty, innocent are not entirely clarified in Thomas.

The Catholic Church points to the following important considerations in justification of its view:

1. It is a fact that precisely the healthy, economically propertied forces in Germany—and that is likely to be so everywhere—impose upon themselves a voluntary birth limitation. With the exclusion of the hereditarily diseased from reproduction the question of the birth collapse is therefore by no means settled, if the healthy, economically well-situated circles do not impose sacrifices upon themselves for their own nationality from moral, not from eugenic reasons, to achieve a high birth rate. But has any state in history ever succeeded through legislative measures in also influencing this essential part of population policy? Does a sterilization law therefore actually serve the totality of the population or is it not merely one-sidedly dominated by the concept of race? Thus far no state that has introduced sterilization has yet published exact statistics on the actual population policy successes of these measures, above all not on the question of whether hereditarily healthy offspring has increased

there. Moreover, research on hereditary diseases is also hardly so advanced that one could here make secure decisions with ease.

2. The power of procreation is an essential element of personality. Man can indeed renounce the exercise of this natural disposition for reasons of higher order (love of God), but the elimination of the capacity itself must count as mutilation.

3. Precisely the care of the helpless has always been in human history the source of a heroic self-sacrifice for others; no human being may be excluded from this love. The greater the neediness, the more accommodating the readiness to help must become.

4. Sterilization can be imposed as punishment by the state for a corresponding offense, but in the case of the hereditarily diseased one can hardly speak of personal guilt.

5. Since the purpose of marriage is twofold (Canon Law, Canon 1013), marriages of persons sterilized by state compulsion above ecclesiastical constraint are not to be prevented, whereby however the other party, who learns of this sexual condition of his partner only after the marriage conclusion, can if appropriate raise the suit for separation before the ecclesiastical court (Canon 1119).

6. In the modern eugenic efforts lies the danger of radicalism, so that national eugenics will soon see only the germ cell and race, but no longer the soul as the structural principle of body and spirit. Once the barriers are broken through in the question of sterilization, the way to legitimizing eugenic pregnancy interruption is also not very far (compare the decision of the canton of Vaud of November 17, 1931 on eugenic indication for pregnancy interruption, whose legal permissibility is incumbent upon the health council). Incidentally, the repercussion of sterilization could be an uninhibited enjoyment of life beyond good and evil with the consequences of increased venereal diseases.

7. Marriage may not be viewed only from the viewpoint of maintaining racial purity. Biological need must be remedied with morally permissible means. The state does not have the tasks of a breeding institution and therefore also not the right to fulfill population policy tasks with means contrary to natural law (bodily injury), because the same purpose can also be achieved through other moral means.

8. The surgically performed sterilization may not be judged in its moral significance according to the intervention that is certainly not dangerous per se and is completed in a few minutes, which does not impair the treated person in his capacity to work. The possibility of restoring fertility through a reverse operation even after years exists, even if actual successes of the same cannot be guaranteed. The sterilization of women is moreover, although this too does not signify a difficult operation according to expert medical judgments, not completely inconsequential. The psychological consequences of such an intervention are however more difficult to judge, because the operation is naturally performed on persons who are not entirely mentally healthy.

9. More important than the interventions of the state in the most personal realms of man is the change in the modern worldview, which is characterized by a lax sexual morality and an ever stronger deviation from the concepts that have been valid for centuries concerning the purpose of marriage and family life. Here it would be the duty of university teachers to make the young generation of physicians more responsible again.

10. Racial-hygienic marriage prohibitions alone without simultaneous prohibition of extramarital sexual intercourse will bring no successes, quite apart from the fact that they are a severe intrusion into personal freedom, which cannot be justified without

further ado by the alleged benefit of maintaining the health of the race.

11. The most important means is a eugenic-pastoral education of young people for marriage, in order to achieve a re-Christianization of the German family in harmony with the biological and moral natural laws.

7. NATION & NATIONALITY. NATIONAL-POLITICAL EFFORTS TOWARD THE UNITY OF THE GERMANS IN THE EUROPEAN SPHERE.

Together with the concept of race, those of nation and nationality form the essential foundations of the National Socialist worldview. Almost all other doctrines and programmatic demands flow back to these concepts, finding their justification and deepening somehow in them and appearing on the other hand as their self-evident conclusions, so that one can rightly speak of a dogmatic system of National Socialism. Here too is repeated the fact often established in intellectual history, that ideas are often already present for decades and form the object of serious debates, until they receive their culmination in a personality or in intellectual currents. Thus it was natural that at the beginning of the 19th century the concepts nation and nationality were raised to the object of deeper investigations by philosophers and poets; this appears all the more self-evident in our days, after Oswald Spengler through his "discovery" of the alleged process of rigidification and the decomposition of the synthetic forces of our culture had presented a hopeless diagnosis for the future. In order to bring to a standstill this course of development of emancipation from God and from one's fellow man and the detachment from all responsibility, and in order to restrain the atomization of human society in marriage, family,

science, and economy, many today see only one way out, namely that of a reconstruction of the concepts nation and nationality, which in fact possess a community-binding force, in order to prevent the constantly progressing individualization. The gradual conceptual formation of nation and nationality occurred in wave-like fashion in the past. All great currents—Romanticism, Liberalism, Democracy—have stamped their own expression of the national idea with a particular constitutional-legal ideal. The so-called German Movement, which struggles over these concepts, counts representatives in the Enlightenment period, in the epoch of the Storm and Stress period, of Romanticism, of the Idealism of the historical schools, and also individually standing personalities such as Ludwig Jahn and only partially Goethe, who cannot be classified into any particular category. Thus the struggle over the concepts nation and nationality knows many curves with heights and depths. Only slowly do both concepts detach themselves ever more clearly from the daily struggle, in order to become the philosophical foundation of political movements. Still quite unclear are the thoughts of Ernst Moritz Arndt despite all attempts to demonstrate his leadership role in the direction toward the Third Reich through a skillful selection of his writings. A large part of his writings with the pathos of language has become indigestible for the sober age in which we live, because we miss in him the clarity of conceptual formation. One also sees oneself confronted with manifold difficulties when one wishes to assign Fichte a proper place in the developmental series toward nationality. Some find in his writings almost everywhere parallels to National Socialism. Fichte is supposed to be the great, German-believing and national educator par excellence, whose basic demands—the idea of racial improvement, the welding together of the nation from the tribes—lead directly into the world of National Socialism. Others, in whom the wish is not the father of thoughts even for

scientific works, are more cautious, including his biographer Reinhold Schneider, who despite his admiration for Fichte does not overlook the manifold vacillations of the same in questions of Germanness, nor the uncertain attitude toward Christianity, where we can establish over wide stretches commonalities between Fichte and Lagarde. Whereas according to the ideas of the French Revolution the nation is only the community of free citizens who bring obedience to the laws they have given themselves for reasons of politics and reason, Herder had already founded the nation as a multiplication of families and tribes—in modern terms racially-biologically—as something natural and fateful for man. These thoughts were taken up by German Romanticism and expanded in the sense that the foundations of nationality must be given racially and according to blood, so that the foundation of the state could not be something historically accidentally become, a world-citizenship, but rather the race-conscious national nationality. Since the appearance of Herder, whose world of thought was only made more popular by Arndt and Fichte, the German national idea stands in competition with the French national-state idea, and its tremendous influence on the far-flung state-world of the Slavic East proves that a great political force inheres in this concept to shatter an old world. From German Idealism—Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel—came also in contrast to the Christian-Roman imperial idea that of the Holy Empire of the Germans as the "people par excellence." Thus it became the seedbed of later constitutional German conceptions and of an ethical idealism—heroic worldview lying in the blood. Particularly German Romanticism must be designated as that movement which has contributed incomparably more than the age of the Classics to prepare the foundations of the national movement and the general conceptual formation of nation and nationality. Men from all German tribes and from both confessions have since Romanticism,

to which belongs the greatest merit in the national awakening of the German people, worked out the leading concepts nation and nationality, without however understandably presupposing the racial-blood foundation as a condition for them, however much similar thoughts often seem to resound in their writings. Particularly important for the 19th century are the following personalities to be named: Friedrich von Schlegel (Philosophical Lectures, Romantic Fragments), the Catholic political teacher Adam Müller, Franz von Baader, Jakob Grimm, Joseph von Görres, Franz Ritter von Buß, Adolf Kolping, von Radowitz, Friedrich Pilgram, Baron von Ketteler, Franz Hitze. Since this time the historical school of law—Justus Möser, Savigny, Puchta—political economy (Friedrich List) and constitutional theory could no longer bypass the national idea. Ever more clearly the nation appears as the community of people who strive for their own state for the sake of its sovereignty. People of the same linguistic and cultural community yield the concept of nation, whereby landscape, religion and history everywhere create their own genius. Numerous differences separate the Reich German from the Austrians, German Swiss and Germans abroad. The same nation has everywhere its own face determined by the intellectual sphere in which it can develop. In view of this abundance of individual expression of the same spirit it is difficult to say in which part the nation has found its exemplary form giving direction for all. History, religion and geographical space can also individually work so strongly that even the main characteristic of the nation, the consciousness of a community of fate, is pushed back—Holland, Flemings, Swiss-Reich Germany. Every nation has its nationality, without however the concepts nation and people being equivalent. While the former goes into depth and is founded on a certain soul-community, the people is often only a political concept. One can speak of an Austrian and Swiss people, but hardly of such a nation. The Austrian is the

German in the Austrian cultural sphere. Whereas in the prewar period the concepts nation and nationality developed ever more clearly from the scientific and political debates, after the war strong personalities through reflection upon the conservative forces of history have carried the thoughts nation and nationality into wide circles. In Moeller van den Bruck and Othmar Spann the human being appears in the sense of the ancient conception of Aristotle almost only as valuable insofar as he lives and works in community. National Socialism therefore already had a great body of material available on the questions of nation and nationality when it took a step further and brought both concepts into the closest essential connection with those of race and blood, whereas according to Spann nationality represents a spiritual assimilation of people without racial conditioning who appear united in a state within a common settlement area. Spann also gives the supranational Church priority over the national-ecclesiastical organization, because the state too ranks only after religion, in which it possesses its spiritual precondition. Against this the National Socialist leadership organ of youth writes:

In blood-bound nationality is mirrored the racial soul, which we cannot tangibly represent but whose creative working we feel and intuit in the great personalities. Thus from the racial soul arises nationality, which in its multiformity and greatness is the bearer of this personality and which grows beyond itself to those great cultural spheres that have been solely and exclusively the bearers of progress and of the development of humanity in this world. But cultural spheres are in turn determined only by races and racial souls. Thus we have here discovered a new creative law that in its cycle encompasses the totality of life. With this view we stand in crass contrast to those universalistic views that for centuries dominated our people, and have again anew found a vital center of

our existence that gives us the possibility of building a worldview as sublime and magnificent as has never yet been beheld.

Similarly Manteuffel-Kazdangen expresses himself:

Whereas Fascism regards the state and nationality as the ultimate goal, thus in a certain sense as the totality, National Socialism under the influence of the national idea consciously emphasizes alongside it yet a higher whole, the race.

Thus National Socialism differs essentially from Fascism, which has remained stuck in the ancient Roman national concept and therefore has also retained the standpoint of Liberalism for respect for foreign national minority nationalities and foreign cultural values: "People and territory are the nation, which is realized in the state as legal form." Seen from the National Socialist perspective, only the presence of particular hereditary masses yields the concept of the people; in other words, a state authority has the right to demand respect and protection only if it corresponds to the interests of nationality. All these conceptual interpretations are brought together in bold form into a philosophy of the Third Reich by Hermann Schwarz, in whose teaching alongside the concepts nation and nationality all others—including the religious ones—are only of secondary rank. In the nation is revealed a "divine life that sanctifies man."

As with Fichte, according to the conception of Schwarz as well, a divine life-stream flows first from nationality to individuals, so that service to the people becomes an ethical magnitude of the first rank. Schwarz rejects every form of Christianity as unsuited to grasp the values nationality and fatherland-experience. Service to both the latter requires no sanctification from religious spheres, but sanctifies itself. People and nation are the revelation of a most supreme divine value-quality. "Nationality, nation and fatherland are the kingdom of heaven, and there is nothing higher."

No one will find objectivity in the thoughts of Schwarz, who wants to elevate National Socialism into a superworldly life-conception, still less that which was understood as philosophy in the sense of the Greek Classics. Neither the pioneering analyses of the concept community by Ferdinand Tönnies nor the value-philosophy of Max Scheler—to say nothing of similar expositions in Thomas Aquinas—find any appreciation or utilization in this self-satisfied interpretation of the concepts nation and nationality.

The question: What is a nation?, which Ernst Renan in the year 1882 wanted to solve with the well-known words "The existence of a nation is a daily plebiscite," simply cannot be answered with the concepts of race and blood either, both of which have themselves not yet received a clear scientific delimitation. The main question still remains open: How does that spiritual, soul-unity come about that founds the essence of a nation and a people? A racial and national soul that hovers as it were over the individual members and "expresses" itself in them could indeed be assumed, but could be conceptually explained by no one. How further is the rank-order of religion and nationality? Pembaur, who emphasizes the psychic-spiritual element of these concepts more strongly, goes the ways of National Socialism when he writes, "we cannot expect a pre-formation of our relationship toward the national whole from religious views." Against this the faith says that it belongs to the essence of Christianity that in the moral world-order the religious must retain the primacy. It is furthermore a natural consequence of the biological higher-valuation of the Nordic hereditary mass when Stapel, who strongly influenced National Socialism through his religious-cultural-philosophical thoughts, writes: "Just as in truth there is no equality of men, so also no such equality of nations... If the Polish nation would place itself on a level with the German, that would be not just, but absurd. Always must the lesser values yield to

the higher ones. Otherwise life is not possible. Human community is by nature not arranged for equality. The bearer of the new imperialism can only be the German nation... One thing we demand: the imperium. Where the same is not granted to us, it must be won. For we are not equal to the others, but we are Germans."

The overstrain of the racially-biologically felt national idea is carried forward by some so far that they also advocate a complete deconfessionalization of the entire life, above all also of national customs, because the expressions of the German national soul have been "covered over" by Christianity. Custom must therefore be separated according to racially-appropriate and racially-foreign (Christian) components and be drawn out from the influence of the Church, in order to create a German national folklore on racial foundation; for Christianity has never become a "national religion" among the Germans!

Some representatives of the National Socialist concept of nationality hope, with its realization in the political life of Europe, also to prepare a new worldview, a supranational peace-order and a new international law, and speak of a European national idea. The right of self-determination of peoples on the basis of the nationality-idea is thereby also "ideologically" founded:

Only when the nations have reflected upon themselves, as the German nation has done,... only when the other nations that have not yet done so work according to the same plans, then will a great goal be achieved: then will world peace be secured. The feared German dynamism is not directed aimlessly into the expanse. It is ignited by the violation of the right of self-determination of German national comrades and extinguishes of itself when the national-German idea comes into its right.

The Austrian problem is also here, even if undesignated, present as an imaginary point of perspective toward which all lines run.

The further development of the racially-biologically grasped concept of nation leads to the political demand of belonging to the all-German nationality, which is also scientifically undergirded. The mechanistic national-state concept of the West, of Prussia and Bismarck is replaced by an organic principle of state-formation: nationality.

Programmatic are the words of Hitler, who places the salvation and future of the nation in the cohesion of its own nationality, which has also been taken up as the first point in the work-goal of National Socialism, and furthermore also the thoughts of the leading National Socialist pedagogue Ernst Krieck, in whose educational work National Socialism appears as a freedom movement borne by national-racial elementary forces.

National Socialism is thereby raised to another level that no German political party previously claimed. It appears in these writers as the biologically naturally willed movement for the unity of the Germans scattered in the European sphere. Thus Krieck speaks of a "racially-national-political anthropology"—a daring connection of different contents and concepts.

All these philosophical new formations suffer above all from the unclarity of the basic concepts, for the words "race, peoplehood, blood and nation," loaded with the emotional content of an incalculable political activism, yield a conceptual dictionary that has not yet been verified.

Even if the hard reality of historical life dismantles much of these goals or postpones them to a distant future, yet in the idea as such lie forces that cannot be without effect especially on youth. Race

and people are elevated by the leading National Socialist literature to sacral concepts, which everything else must serve.

The national-political efforts toward the unity of all Germans in Europe therefore form the object of attentive observation on the part of the leading National Socialist circles. This program-point is regarded as unalterable and could be postponed only from considerations of prudence and reason of state. The unification of the Germans remains however the immovable final goal of National Socialism.

The growing German youth, whose dark longing in Europe is directed toward a new worldview of unified style, because they believe in the divine Logos in historical development, will not get rid of this thought earlier before another stronger idea could displace it. Something similar lies incidentally also at the basis of the Italian mysticism of Fascism with its claim to the universality of Rome (CAUR), which also shows itself in the geographically-political maps on the Via dell'Impero of the Eternal City.

Also in this fateful question of the unification of all Germans, which in recent years has brought so much soul-division into families, correct and unripened assertions go alongside one another, since some so greatly exceed the biologically-racial national concept that according to their conception only National Socialist states could secure peace in Europe at all. In the excessive enthusiasm for the lesser-German-Prussian state-ideal that with some modifications prevailed until the end of the Hohenzollern Empire, Prussia is glorified as champion of this idea; against this the House of Habsburg is fought with a passion that one only brings up against things that are precisely not yet dead, but harbor values of life. No objective historical researcher, however nationally minded he may be, can, as soon as he places the Habsburg Empire in the great context of history and sees not the German state but the German nation in the

center of his consideration, deny the merits of this dynasty even in purely German concerns. One could not demand in a multi-national state, in which the Germans made up a relatively small percentage, an exclusively German state-policy without liquidating the meaning of a multi-national monarchy. Incidentally the German influence never reached so deeply into Eastern and Southern Europe—German officialdom, German commercial language, military language of command—never were so many national resettlements carried out in favor of Germanness as under Maria Theresa and Joseph II (Transylvanian Banat Swabians). To be sure, then through the policy of Bismarck in the year 1866 this German influx into Austria was stopped. Thus the old monarchy was the hitherto best consolidation of the spatially-politically united national fragments and small peoples of East-Central Europe under German cultural leadership. Whoever frees himself from the distortions and prejudices of which so many political historians of the 19th century have made themselves guilty, will in the sense of Srbik, whose newest work together with Meinecke's "World-Citizenship and National State" inaugurates a new section of our historical understanding, have to approach the question of why people, space, empire and state have not yet become a unity for the Germans and why German history, which is so rich in the heroic and the great, also harbors so much of the tragic and the profound until 1866 and to the present day more than the history of the other great cultural peoples.

In any case the German-Austrian character, which was formed by the supranational imperial idea and the constant contact with Slavic, Hungarian and Romance nationality, through tribes, provincial destiny and Catholic cultural ideal, has remained a unity of political structure that in some concerns stands closer to the South German than to the North German, a special type of German essence, without the German-Austrian therefore being able to be

regarded as one completely blood-different from the North German. Whereas Frederick II of Prussia carried no German cultural consciousness in himself, although he formed millions of German people, in Austria despite the mixture of peoples the feeling of belonging together with the Reich has always remained alive particularly in the literary and scientific sphere despite all barriers.

The question of the unification of the Germans in Europe would therefore in itself be only a political problem that, as long as the means to achieve this goal do not come into conflict with ethics, would have to be solved from political considerations and judged according to the same standards that were decisive for similar efforts of the Italians, Poles, Northern and Southern Slavs. States have become historically and are subject to changes. As a purely political problem the question of a reconfiguration of Europe from national perspectives does not at first belong before the forum of the Christian worldview, if the above-mentioned cautions are observed, since indeed a violent solution is excluded. There has never been a statics in national politics, least of all in the European sphere, and no one will deflect political, national ideas that fight their way through in history for the long term from their goal-clarity, if he cannot set against them other, still greater and more attractive ideas. The state treaty between Germany and Austria of July 11, 1936, in which Austria's significance as the second German state is established, solved the disputed relationship of the two German states in a manner that satisfies both parts for a further development of common working of German nationality. The natural abundance of mutual interests in all areas of life connects of course the German people of both states, whereby however the cultural interests of Austria, quite particularly the treatment of Catholicism, may by no means be overlooked. Thus the development of the Austrian question has indeed in recent years given non-experts in the

circumstances the impression as if ecclesiastical Rome, the Vatican, were the strong counterpole to the German unity idea. However, that is here an accidental coincidence, for the Anschluss question has moreover, apart from foreign-policy considerations, been transformed primarily by the areligious, ideological incursion of various writers into the National Socialist program into a problem of religious conscience for the Catholics of Austria. If the cultural policy of National Socialism had gone other ways, the entire question would have developed essentially differently. A resistance on religious grounds would perhaps never have been so strongly raised, although the confessional statistics were already of decisive significance for the relationship of Germany and Austria in the Peace of Nikolsburg precisely for the policy of Bismarck toward Austria.

Precisely when the unity of the Germans in Europe is spoken of, may a peculiar word of Treitschke, the trailblazer of National Socialism in the historical field, be brought here, who, although a "nationalist," remarkably in the question of the unification of Germany and Austria places religious, ideological questions thoroughly in the foreground:

Nowhere during the most recent weeks have so many warm and honest wishes for Austria's continued existence been exchanged as in the meeting rooms of the German Reichstag... Today even the assembled power of the united Germany would have to waste long, decades-heavy and perhaps fruitless work on this soil, if we ever took over the sad inheritance of the Habsburgs here. We already possess far too many ultramontane enemies of the Reich; we will keep them in bounds; yet our Reich is only therefore a parity state because the Protestants predominate in it. But the disintegration of Austria would be a revolution unprecedented in all history that threatens to involve us in unforeseeable wars. We Germans have never understood the nationality principle in the crude and exaggerating

sense that all Europeans of German tongue must belong to our state. We regard it as fortunate for the peaceful intercourse of the continent that the borders of nations are not as it were carved into the earth's crust with a knife; that still millions of Frenchmen live outside France, millions of Germans outside the German Reich..., the firm foundation of our present power, the creative thoughts of the new German policy were created by the blessed year 1866. Away from Austria! was then our battle-cry. As if freed from a nightmare, Germany's breast breathed freely when we separated ourselves from Austria. Every new day of German history proved since then that that separation was a necessity, that we were only thereby given back to ourselves. Should we now in unbridled covetousness throw over again the structure of 1866, the foundation walls of our Reich?... In sober Berlin the opinion that the natural capital of the Danubian lands should become a German provincial city is ridiculed as a utopia...

Precisely in the question of the unification of all Germans of Europe appears, as these expositions of Treitschke best prove, as a great doom and fateful deed of German history Luther's ecclesiastical conflict in Wittenberg; therefore the attempt to present him as a national hero must also be rejected from the standpoint of a German history that thinks not in decades but in centuries. Just as Herder first stimulated the national view of Hutten, so he also points first to the connection of Luther with the people, in order to celebrate his Rome-rejection as a national deed. This national appreciation has since then never completely disappeared from the Luther-image (something similar we see in the Hus-veneration of the Czechs) and experiences in our days in National Socialism a particular emphasis. The National Socialist writers recall thereby Fichte and Arndt, who already glorified Luther as a national hero, and support themselves above all on Chamberlain, who in his book "Foundations of the 19th

Century" openly declared: "Luther is primarily a political hero. Love of fatherland was to him the unconditional, theological learning the conditional, in which he never completely cast off the monk's cowl. The weak point in him was theology." This scientifically disputed conception of the personality of Luther Rosenberg has adopted in his "Myth of the 20th Century." Already Erasmus of Rotterdam however saw in the ecclesiastical split the greatest blow against Germanness itself, whose avoidance would have spared Germany the Thirty Years' War. While England, France and Spain could devote themselves to the tasks of culture and art, so that a period of flourishing occurred, Germany was made into a desert. When Goethe and Schiller appeared, the great tradition in German nationality was not only broken off but destroyed. Only the reconstruction through Romanticism has won back Germanness for its own national culture. Protestantism and the Counter-Reformation entering later as necessary counter-effect have divided people and empire into two camps, weakened the imperial power, culturally completely separated the German individual states from one another, drawn Germany into the great struggles of confessionally divided Europe, and precisely in a time of the greatest world-political decision made the German people, the then-given bearer of the world-imperial idea, incapable of this task.

Precisely German history of the 17th and 18th centuries proves that the Reformation of the 16th century, often declared to be primordially German, has developed into a misfortune for our people. Long ago would unity have been won, never would the religious conflicts of the 17th century have come, which threw all of North Germany from a flourishing Catholic culture back by centuries, without setting anything fully valuable, of equal kind in its place. The proof is not difficult that with the 15th and even more

with the 16th century the decline of universal German thinking and of the concepts nation and nationality began.

FUNDAMENTALS FROM THE CHRISTIAN STANDPOINT ON THE QUESTION OF NATION & NATIONALITY.

1. The biological interpretation of the concept of nationality, which is not identical with race but is determined above all by language, common history and living space, contains in itself, even if the two foundations blood and race have not yet found sufficient scientific explanation, no opposition to Christianity, as long as a primatial position is not demanded for nationality over the Christian worldview and the center of gravity of human and national life is not placed exclusively in the here-and-now. In Christianity the division of men according to nations and races is regarded as a secondary phenomenon that cannot abolish the unity of the human race.

2. Also the concepts nation and nationality, which contain great goods, must according to Christian teaching take their place in the general hierarchy of life-values. Nationality bears true, but not the highest life-values in itself. Its spiritual content is not self-contained. It harbors in itself no ultimate goal and cannot fill our soul. Nationality struggles and wavers, changes and forms itself ever anew, like the searching man who belongs to it. Nationality is never the final perfection of humanity if it does not receive its purification and consecration through Christianity. The national idea must therefore be refined from the Christian perspective and clarified in its demands, in order not to end in a mass-selfishness.

No nation has all values in itself and none can therefore claim a primacy for itself to receive the leadership-role in Europe (against Stapel). All require ethical purification through Christian ethos.

3. The national idea and pride in one's own nationality requires, in order not to end in a cramped I-selfishness and to narrow the view for general-human problems, a completion through the virtue of humility, which is not weakness but truth, namely strict self-examination and a reflection on one's own errors and weaknesses, in order, instructed by the great mother and educator of peoples, the Catholic world-Church, to bring national distinctiveness to precious unfolding. Also in the German character lie alongside splendid dispositions great weaknesses that require a mitigation or completion from other national circles: a strong drive toward individualism, toward the subjective, a certain one-sidedness, exclusivity and harshness in the assertion of an once-adopted standpoint. All this requires a strong formal element in order not to dissipate and dissolve.

4. True nationality is impossible in the long run without religion. A separation of both areas is an error, since both essentially belong together. Therefore the complete deconfessionalization of national customs must be rejected as an attack on nationality and Christianity alike by everyone for whom, in the sense of the National Socialist program, Article 24, a positive Christianity should remain the foundation of the national community.

5. Wherever religion and nation appear to be in opposition, the solution, if it does not concern morally indifferent, purely political questions, must be taken from the religious sphere, that is, the confession to nationality has its limitation in the recognition of a divine world-order.

Religion and nationality according to Christian conception harmonize so happily in accordance with the order of creation that contradictions between both can only be apparent. The providence-believing man must be convinced that the plan of creation corresponds to the divine goal. If therefore the human race is realized

in different peoples and races, that must be regarded by the believing person as expression of the divine will. With this thought is thoroughly compatible the notion that the natural talents are distributed among the peoples in different ways, that there are therefore also peoples who are called to particularly great achievements. Contradictions can only arise if either from the religious side the natural is underestimated and called into question or if from the national side the claim is made that nationality represents the totality of all values under exclusion of religious values or, otherwise expressed, that all values are merely functions of nationality and there exists no spiritual world rising above nature. But neither the one nor the other exaggeration can be founded from the principles of religion and the necessities of nationality.

6. Since the struggle for national existence and inherent right and for the recovery of the place in the sun brings with it in nationality and state far-reaching transformations and appears almost impossible without tensions and conflicts, it is the duty of the Christian and nationally thinking citizen to collaborate to bring about a reconciliation of both spheres of interest in the sense of natural law and the Christian moral law, from whose obligations no national community can escape.

7. In totalitarian nationality there is no longer any unpolitical person. The normal type of citizen becomes the "political man." Here too lies at first no contradiction to Christianity, as long as the first norm-giving and direction-giving element for human action can remain Christianity.

8. Since Christianity according to origin and essence as revealed word of God is removed from all national and racial conditioning, every overstrain of nationality must be rejected and every worldview that is determined solely by the idea of race and nationality. Also state, people and race stand under God's word. Here

too results the same conclusion that was already mentioned in the treatment of the race-problem, that also from the National Socialist concept of nationality, whether it may be correct in particulars or not, a danger threatens Christianity only in the case of its radicalization and transfer into the realm of religious culture.

9. German nationality and Catholic spirit of faith have in the course of centuries grown inseparably together. Whoever disputes that proves himself insufficiently informed about the facts of German intellectual and cultural history.

National thinking and Catholic conviction are therefore anything but unbridgeable opposites. Countless examples from the past are proof of this. It may suffice here to point to a few particularly significant personalities:

The Rhinelander Joseph Görres helped in decisive fashion to prepare spiritually and soulfully the liberation struggle against Napoleon.

In the midst of the liberalistic age, champions for the preservation pure of German nationality, of a civic education rooted in homeland and people, and for the renewal of German culture were the Rhenish priest Anton Heinen and the converted Frisian Julius Langbehn, the Rembrandt-German. In incomparable fashion the Sudeten German Josef Nadler portrayed the inner richness and intellectual achievements of the German tribes. The opening up of the deep treasures that rest in old German saga, legend and epic poetry was the work of the Viennese Richard von Kralik. The first collection of old German folk-songs ("The Boy's Magic Horn") we owe to the Rhine-Franconian Clemens Brentano.

The first national "History of the Germans" that according to the judgment of the Protestant historian Johannes Haller truly deserves this name was written by the Catholic priest Michael Ignaz

Schmidt (died 1794), whose bust stands in the Munich Hall of Fame.

Who through the founding of the first "German School Association," the predecessor of today's "National League for Germanness Abroad," became one of the greatest benefactors of Germans abroad? The South Tyrolean priest Franz Xaver Mitterer. Who created the first association for the scientific study and practical cultivation of the deep values of German nationality? The Bavarian chaplain Christian Frank, and thus it would not be difficult to continue this list into the present and also to remember the leading activity of so many German Catholics abroad, who have unfolded not only a religious-pastoral but also wide-reaching, culturally-national activity for the blessing of the whole German nationality, and all this decades before there was at all an organized German work abroad.

8. THE CONCEPT OF THE STATE & LEADERSHIP. LAW, POWER & MORALITY. ROMAN & GERMAN LAW. THE POLITICAL ORDER CONCEPT.

While the state doctrine of Marxism rests principally on the philosophy of Rousseau, the foundation of National Socialism is German philosophy, whereby in certain respects the naturalism of Rousseau forms the connecting link between both worldviews, for both share, though not to the same degree, the denial of original sin and the belief in the unconditional goodness of human nature. While, however, the ideas of nationhood and race stand completely foreign, indeed hostile, to Marxism, which has grown out of the liberal world of ideas of the French Revolution, both form essential foundations of the National Socialist conception of state, law and justice. Up to a certain limit, as the preceding section has shown,

these are doubtless viable elements whose danger zone only begins when they are carried over into the religious and formed into an independent moral culture in the sense of naturalism. The latter would have to mean the collapse of Christianity and the return to a national totality worldview which ancient culture did not know to this extent.

Five fundamental pillars of German legal formation, corresponding to these new life-laws of the nation, can be established in the renewal work in the area of National Socialist law: soil, race, state, honor and work.

The constitutional principles, partly written, partly unwritten, which dominate and shape all life and which already appear to be laid down in a series of fundamental state laws—criminal, family and marriage law still awaits corresponding change—are the following:

1. The National Socialist worldview is the ideological foundation of the existence and thus of the organization of the German Reich. The National Socialist idea has its organizational seat in the Party. (Hitler.)

2. The Reich is the legally ordered and politically formed people. The nation is content and substance of the Reich. It is the object of all order. The people created by God is as the permanent and existing the sole purpose of all human action and all state institutions.

3. The Reich is a socialist state: common benefit takes precedence over self-interest. What benefits the national community is law, what harms it, injustice.

4. The Reich is a völkisch state: blood and soil are the ever-renewing life-source of the German people. The purity and maintenance of health of German blood is the prerequisite of the German people and Reich. Only the German or racially related

person can have a say in the destiny and future of the German people.

5. The Reich is a leader-state: Party, people and Reich are directed and administered according to the leadership principle. One becomes a leader through achievement that convinces the followers.

6. The Reich is a people's state: the foundation of the Reich and its leadership is the relationship of trust and loyalty of the followers to the leader.

7. The Reich is a unitary state: there is now only one Reich state-power and one Reich sovereignty; there are only German nationals and Reich citizens.

8. The Reich is a one-party state: The Party represents the political conscience, the political conception and the political will of the nation. (Hitler.) It must set the great goals in all areas of life and bring public life into harmony with völkisch duties. The Leader is the Party and the Party is the Leader. The Party is the final supervising and deciding authority.

9. The Party must in its organization gather, promote and assign to the state for its leadership and as its followers the elements of the nation capable of political leadership. It must thereby represent the principle that all Germans are to be educated ideologically as National Socialists, that further the best National Socialists become party members and that finally the best party members assume the leadership of the state. (Hitler.) It must above all give the German state the supreme and general leadership.

10. The leader of the Party is in each case the head of the Reich and supreme commander of the armed forces.

11. Party and armed forces are the two supporting, indissolubly connected pillars of people and Reich. The Party gives the army the people and the people give the army the soldiers, but

both together thereby give the German Reich the security of inner peace and the strength for its assertion. (Hitler.)

These fundamental ideas of National Socialist legal conception must, as soon as they can be thought through consistently and implemented in life, have as a consequence an entirely different attitude also in international law. The decisive political axiom that the national community is the foundation of all cultural, intellectual as well as political development demands, alongside the commitment to one's own national community, necessarily the recognition of foreign national groups. While the international law conception of the nineteenth century proclaimed the undisputed primacy of the state and basically knew only the state-people, the National Socialist people's law and international law theory demanded, even where a national group split off from the mother-people is incorporated into a foreign state structure, the fundamental recognition under international law of this national group in the legal form of cultural autonomy, because every other so-called minority-legal regulation according to the liberal-individualistic principle has in fact also proven inadequate in practice.

National Socialism thus wants a positive recognition of the differently constituted part of the people and opposes to the assimilation theory völkisch cultural autonomy. It condemns every type of denationalization as incompatible with the basic prerequisites of National Socialist international law conception.

From this attitude toward the law-creating and culture-creating power of the national community arises the anti-imperialist basic position of National Socialist international law thinking, in other words, National Socialism fundamentally has, on the basis of its program, no interest in the incorporation of foreign national groups or in the internal absorption of individuals by way of denationalization.

The foundations of these constitutional views of National Socialism do not merely go back to the state-philosophical system of Hegel and his successors, but ultimately to the following basic dogmas, which in turn necessarily result from racial doctrine: "The essence of law is racially conditioned." Essential content of German law must therefore be provisions that preserve the racial hereditary substance. Law is not an autonomous domain, but in it is reflected the political and economic struggle of the people.

The individual must integrate himself into the we of the people, into the socialism of blood. The freedom of the individual is socially bound, his political action results only from his völkisch foundation. State and freedom are inseparable concepts. There is political freedom only in and for the state and not from the state. While according to ancient Germanic law the freedom of the individual was limited in favor of clan and family, here it occurs in the interest of the state, in which the legal source is the racially determined national spirit.

According to National Socialist legal conception, the people as original community stands in the foreground, not the state. The state is legitimized from the people, not vice versa. From this follows a series of decisive conclusions. The concepts honor and loyalty, welfare of the generality, public security must be interpreted in the National Socialist sense, so that a transformation of thinking should also occur in legal life.

Also in these questions one recognizes immediately that National Socialism wants to be a unified whole. While individual representatives still teach a new international law built on the racial foundation, others reject international law altogether, because law as a race-bound phenomenon coincides with the state itself. Characteristic are the following pronouncements of leading personalities:

Adolf Hitler:

a) The state is not an end in itself, but the means for the development of the forces slumbering in the race.

"The fundamental recognition is... that the state represents no purpose, but a means. It is indeed the prerequisite for the formation of a higher human culture, but not its cause. This lies rather exclusively in the presence of a race capable of culture."

"If one... speaks of a higher mission of the state, one must never forget that the higher mission lies essentially in the nationhood, to which the state through the organic power of its existence has only to enable free development."

b) The völkisch state places race at the center of general life.

"Whoever speaks of a mission of the German people on earth must know that it can only consist in the formation of a state that sees its highest task in the preservation and promotion of the uninjured noblest components of our nationhood, indeed of all humanity."

"... A völkisch state will thus have first of all to lift marriage out of the level of permanent racial disgrace, to give it the consecration of that institution which is called to beget images of the Lord..."

Helmut Nicolai:

c) The relationship of the state and the judge to law.

"That state power is lawful which acts in accordance with the legal idea, which preserves law and handles it as it is in accordance with the eternal, life-lawfully correct legal thought."

"The source of customary law is the legal conscience of the people, the national spirit, which receives its particular expression from racial disposition."

"The struggle against racial disgrace is the most important task of legal policy. A... marriage prohibition is commanded between

different peoples, but not between similar ones, thus not between Germanic peoples."

On the occasion of the founding of the Academy for German Law on October 1, 1935, the leader of the German Legal Front, Minister Dr. Frank, could declare: "The struggle is directed today less against the remnants of objective Roman law than rather against the spirit created by centuries-long occupation with Roman law.

"We believe in the Nordic past as a future possibility and now conduct the struggle not only on the legal level against foreign law, but conduct it in the entire intellectual sphere through the introduction of the concept of race.

"German law will in future be racial law. The Academy for German Law has the task to realize this law of the German race with all emphasis in every form."

As the actual intellectual pathfinder may in many respects be regarded Carl Schmitt, to whom a series of such formulations are to be traced back.

All these thoughts make the race concept the foundation of law, state and community, so that the essential task of German law must become the preservation of racial purity.

The further necessity would be the formation of an independent National Socialist philosophy of law to underpin this new legal science. But since legal doctrine appears only to be thought in terms of racial law, legal history would also have to be placed on racial foundations. This introduction of the race concept into the German legal system is also manifestly expressed, since the League of National Socialist German Jurists already in December 1934 resolved on closer cooperation with Rosenberg's National Socialist Cultural Community. Further National Socialist thoughts on state and law are the following:

"Law in the age of community is monistic, that is, its foundations are race and nationhood; in the individualistic state, however, law has a dualistic character and receives its content on the one hand from the spirit of the legal community (the respective ideological foundation of the state entity in question), on the other hand this content of law is determined within the private law order by the will of the contracting parties, in the state by the bearer of state power, without however a particular unified foundation of legal interpretation being present."

Here significant differences appear compared to the state-political ideas of the criminal law teacher Anselm von Feuerbach, even though on the other hand various elements from his criminal law doctrine, especially the secularization, the separation of morality and law, the liberation of criminal law from the sphere of religious-moral evaluations, have been adopted into National Socialist literature.

Feuerbach's principle: "no punishment without law," that is, protection of the citizen against attacks by state power, is in any case rejected. Much, however, that is especially emphasized today by National Socialist jurists is nothing new. Reform efforts for a new German criminal law were already on the agenda in Germany for a considerable time before the seizure of power. Thus already in the year 1929, in order to perfect the individualizing treatment of prisoners, a graduated penal execution was introduced. National Socialism reaches back to all these ideas and efforts in order to radically reshape the entire German legal life, whereby various contradictions to the previous entire European legal science must naturally result. (Compare the draft criminal law code already known to the public in its essential provisions.)

The starting point of all these reforms is the new state idea, which in conscious opposition to the absolutist state concept, as a

mass of subjects, and the liberalistic, as the totality of individual individuals, conceives the state as the living embodiment of the racially conditioned national community. To it law presents itself according to State Secretary Freisler "as the sum of the demands of the national conscience on the people and its members with the goal of the enforcement of the völkisch right to life."

An obvious consequence is the encroachment of criminal law on areas that were previously exclusively regulated by civil law. (Among them counts labor law, where criminal law provisions are to give stronger validity to state measures for the preservation of labor peace.) With such far-reaching interventions of state power and such a manifold application of the penal means, this can only fulfill its purpose if the state is able to break every kind of resistance. Thereby the basic character of punishment has changed. It no longer punishes the criminal act, but aims at rendering the perpetrator harmless or even at his destruction. The new German criminal law is accordingly, according to the formulation of Dr. Freisler, a "perpetrator criminal law" instead of the former "act criminal law." In closest connection with this stands that it is simultaneously a "will criminal law," as it was called by the Reich Justice Minister, and as such rejects the distinction between a successful or merely attempted act. The atonement and deterrence theory dominates the entire criminal law and emerges especially in penal execution.

The dominant influence of the atonement demand, however, had to have as a consequence the striving for complete punishability. The National Socialist legislator believes he addresses this by introducing through the amendments of June 26, 1935 for criminal law and criminal procedure "analogy" as a further legal remedy for finding judgment. That this involved a "revolution in criminal law" was already established by the President of the Academy for German Law, Dr. Frank, upon its publication in the National Socialist Party

Correspondence. The introduction of analogy has put out of force the principle regarded as universally valid for criminal law, anchored in Section 2 of the German Criminal Code: "no crime without law," through the demand "no crime without punishment." The former provision was regarded as an achievement of the modern criminal law school, in order to set firm barriers to judicial arbitrariness in the interest of legal certainty. According to the new provision, a perpetrator is punished not only when the law declares the act punishable, but also when he deserves punishment according to the basic idea of a criminal law and according to "healthy national sentiment."

To the objection that through the introduction of such an immeasurable and changeable factor into the administration of justice uncertainty could arise, the Reich Justice Minister in his lecture at the Criminal Law Congress sought to refute by reference to the uniformity of the National Socialist worldview and its knowledge by the judge. His statements cannot, however, shake the determination that the finding of judgment has lost a support through the loosening of its bond to the law and has not yet found sufficient supplement through the concept of healthy national sentiment. In place of statutory law comes customary law, and the distinction between public and private law is substantially loosened.

As law is designated what Aryan men find to be law, because law means nothing abstract, but is the creation of a particular blood, the result of the blood-bound racial community of the German people and its worldview. It is an obvious further consequence of this common blood-based and ideological foundation that just as little as there is an internationality of true art, can such exist for law. True law can only, if it is to be expression of the shaping national forces and the national will, be people-connected and racially appropriate.

Already pushing into the radical are the following thoughts of individual nationalist writers: "Might goes before right. Moral is what benefits the state, the party or nation. The judicial judgment must be supported from the national and racial sentiment. Only force decides the fate of peoples and states. Reason of state must be beyond good and evil if it wants to have success. The Christian teaching of patience, love and forgiveness effects the downfall of peoples. All Catholic nations have regressed culturally and in terms of power politics. Where, however, as in Italy, a political upswing shows itself, its foundations no longer came over from Christianity, but from the state philosophy of Machiavelli."...

If one carefully examines these thoughts on state and law, one soon notices that they are characterized by a vacillation between revolutionarism and conservatism, so that the question becomes understandable whether National Socialism and rule of law are opposing concepts that exclude each other. Also the official theorist of Italian fascism, Sergio Panunzio, has described the fascist state as a "revolutionary conservative" structure.

Whence come these conceptions of state, law and leadership that must bring about a complete revolutionizing of legal sentiment if they were to penetrate into all states of Europe? Doubtless they are the immediate counteraction of a degenerate democracy that brought about the disintegration of all state authority and statehood, of a pathological party egoism that fragmented the German people after the World War. They are furthermore the practical effect of legal positivism, which also recurs in the state conception of Nietzsche and Treitschke and denies every natural law. Especially through the denial of natural law, the door was opened to the arbitrariness of state legislation already before the World War. In a world that limits the concept of law to the advantages of one's own country and people, everything ends in the boundless and in conceptions that

must lose all form and all measure. Modern people have moreover lost every firm criterion of truth not least through German philosophy and the religious dissolution of Protestantism, so that they cling to every thing that still seems firm to them. However, into this strong emphasis on the law-forming power of the community there also resound the conceptions of the ancient Greeks, which in our days are experiencing a political renaissance. Aristotle established the principle: "Above the individual stands the community as goal and whole." The unconditional predominance of the state over the private is the first and particularly characteristic mark of Attic culture. In Athens the concepts human being and citizen began to coincide completely. What strikes one as so strange in the philosophy and especially in the ethics of a Plato and Aristotle, the equation of individual person and citizen, that springs from the general thinking of Athens. The human being is in the very first place there for the state, not only, which is self-evident, to sacrifice goods and blood in the hour of danger, but his sole activity is actually that for the state.

This complete absorption of the Attic human being in the state was accompanied by not insignificant shadow sides of the Athenian state. That someone kept away from state life or remained neutral in political struggles—which a law of Solon forbade—was excluded. Thus the individual human being was torn from his natural soil, alienated from the clan and family bond and every non-state connection, in order to be fitted exclusively into only state organizations. How strongly this ancient state doctrine acts upon the modern state conception! To this reawakening of old state theories comes the German legal and state philosophy of the present. It would therefore not suffice simply to transfer modern concepts anachronistically only to ancient writers, important as it is to draw this connecting line from the present into the past of Greece.

This brief overview into Greek state history gives us understanding for the development to the modern leader-state:

The state forms in history are characterized by the opposition of individualism and collectivism. At the beginning stands the community state; from its decomposition arises the individualistic state; the teaching of Rousseau is the turning point at which the counter-movement begins; the leader-state brings liberation from individualism. All historical developments of Germany strive toward it. Its goal is the eradication of all individualistic conceptions from constitutional legal conceptualization.

The consequences of the state-philosophical ideas described in the foregoing are: the rejection of Roman law, which is to be replaced by a German common law, the totality of the state concept, leadership with follower-loyalty and the formation of a political elite in a kind of order. Thus there results quite naturally, even if one did not want it directly, a totality of culture and worldview, an anchoring in the absolute (mission of the nation), which is proper to every collectivistically oriented worldview, in other words, National Socialism is only at the beginning of the realization of its program, whereby the final goal does not yet clearly emerge, but certainly the certainty that fundamental confrontations between Christianity and a state formed from these National Socialist legal ideas cannot be avoided, in order then to create between both a viable foundation for understanding. What we experience today are only preliminary skirmishes, perhaps one could say the liberation of the forward area from the wire obstacles that a religion perhaps sometimes somewhat too strongly drawn into politics has left behind from a sinking epoch of the German people.

Since the totality-state will be spoken of further, let only a few remarks be made on the remaining state-philosophical conclusions.

The rejection of Roman law in favor of a German common law is in itself so to speak an internal political matter that has nothing to do with Christianity. What would have to be rejected in this question would be that emotional position-taking which designates Roman law in general as inferior compared to German legal sentiment. We meet the same confusion also today in the assessment of German jurisprudence of the Middle Ages, especially Eike von Repgow, the author of the Sachsenspiegel, who is raised up in order then without the necessary scholarly foundation simply to break the staff over Roman law; the same manner is unfortunately also not infrequently applied when it is a matter of working out the Nordic viewpoint in legal thinking compared to the Roman. We do not want to concern ourselves here with the question whether in Roman law originally so-called Nordic viewpoints were also decisive, which were only later displaced by international influences. (The common law of peoples gains in significance, foreigners receive the right of intermarriage, abolition of the völkisch limitation of marriage. The high-value families are no longer protected, equalization of patricians and plebeians.)

We also do not want to dispute that the influence of Roman law in that form which was handed over to Germany by the law schools of Bologna and Padua became fateful in some respects for the later development of German intellectual life. Perhaps the transfer of foreign legal conceptions also contributed something to the consequences of the Reformation, especially the freedom movements of the Peasants' Wars of the sixteenth century, in Germany.

Without wanting to go into details here that would have to be taken from the works of Ihering: "Spirit of Roman Law," and Fritz Schulz, one thing can be said with complete clarity, that it would be folly to underestimate the value of Roman law that it gained in the reception for German legal life and that will persist to a certain extent as long as there is a legal life at all. No one has given a better conceptual definition of law than the Roman: law is the art of the good and equitable, no one in his legal doctrine has left behind such a masterwork of philosophy and logic in history as Rome and no one coined so early the law of good faith, the principle of trust and belief. Thereby it should not be denied that this law was precisely a "pagan" one with egoistic conceptions about property, treatment of slaves, etc. Doubtless the reception of Roman law in Germany, which was justified by the perfection of the same compared to indigenous law, brought many influences that cannot be reconciled with Germanic mentality (compare inheritance law in the German Sachsenspiegel). Moreover the penetration of Roman law in Germany is greatly overestimated. Wide areas and regions (mining, copyright, German private law, craftsmen and peasantry) remained completely untouched by Roman legal thinking or the same was reshaped in German fashion by the German glossators and the respective legal usage (modern usage), until in many parts of Germany with the introduction of the "General State Law" (1794) it soon had only subsidiary validity. The Reichstag bill for the German Civil Code already established in a memorandum of 1896 that since the reception of Roman law in the late Middle Ages through the many hundreds of states and cities of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, the "Germanic popular laws," as they were first codified in the Sachsenspiegel of Eike von Repgow (1295), always retained strongest influence. Admittedly, a step backward from legal unity to legal particularism (Bavarian and Prussian State Law) was

made through the codifications at the end of the eighteenth and at the beginning of the nineteenth century, without thereby a völkisch German law having been created that also feels in its own pulse-beat that of the German nation. In this sense the striving from the individualism of Roman law to a stronger emphasis on social community law (hereditary farm law, labor and rental law, trust law, private law) can only be welcomed. Here, however, to avoid every exaggeration, may Schlegelberger's word be heeded: "Not everything that is Germanic is therefore already good for us and not everything Roman is therefore already bad." Many supporting ideas of Roman law cannot be escaped even by a modern state entity, and if Roman law on its journey through the history of Europe has repeatedly found grateful veneration and succession or opposition and rejection, this also provides the best proof for the greatness of its historical appearance. Many alleged essential oppositions of Roman and German legal conception dissolve moreover soon when one more carefully examines the passages in question. Above all the claim that Roman law has been instinctively rejected by the German people up to the present day is refuted by the history of four centuries. The reception of Roman law was nothing imposed, but was justified in the special circumstances of Germany from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century (fragmentation of the German Reich, lack of a corresponding legal collection, consequences of the particularism of princes and tribes) and naturally given, because the peasant ancient Germanic law lagged behind the increased needs of an urban culture and would also have meant a cultural burden on Germany in the long run. In any case it is a misrepresentation to ascribe the reception form of Roman law in Germany to "Scholasticism," in other words to Catholicism. On the contrary, the propagandists of Roman law compared to the state laws in Germany were primarily Protestant or anti-ecclesiastically thinking humanists, from Machiavelli to Grotius

and Montesquieu, who all enforced the secularization of Scholastic thinking in the northern Occident. On them the "Code Napoleon" built, which "overcame" in accordance with the principles of the time every inner connection with ecclesiastical legal thinking and in any case took great influence on legal life in Germany. Moreover the Pandects (Digests of the Corpus Juris Civilis) were no longer used in legal practice in Germany already before the creation of the Civil Code of 1896 and already fifty years before National Socialism formed only a special area of legal history.

A special role is also assigned in the National Socialist state concept to leadership. With the totality of the state, this concept forms the main problem of theoretical politics in Europe. It is hardly necessary to emphasize here especially that the form of state leadership is something purely historical that comes and sinks again. Therefore it is also not the task of religion to determine the form. Christianity is possible and conceivable in every state leadership as long as the fundamental demands of natural law and freedom of conscience are not undermined. Considered from the perspective of the history of ideas, leadership is the declaration of bankruptcy of modern democracy, the return to antiquity and the admission of humanity that it has become adrift with the disappearance of Christian sentiment from world politics and in its driftlessness has at least found a substitute in the cult of strong personalities. We encounter the same phenomenon at the end of the Roman Empire, when only individual personalities with firm will and unbending strength, if not preventing the collapse of a cultural epoch, could at least postpone it by several centuries. It is the rule of strong individual personalities predicted by Spengler, in whom Nietzsche's state philosophy has become reality. The dynamic processes and formations of human grouping in the course of history from the sacral aristocratic and royal state to leadership in close connection

with the entire world and life view of the time period prove to us precisely that in declining cultural epochs the leadership principle has repeatedly emerged from history, often for the salvation of a nation, but sometimes also, when it exceeded its powers, to end in a tyranny cast in legal forms (Russian Soviet system). If leadership in modern times wants to persist for a longer time, it must seek its foundation in the establishment of a new culture or worldview, from which this state-political system results naturally as an organically growing phenomenon as prerequisite and simultaneously as crowning conclusion. In other words, every leadership that wants to maintain itself in history and not merely represent a temporary phenomenon, pushes naturally toward a certain cultural state totality.

An important supplement and deepening receives the leadership principle, which sees the primacy not with the state but with politics, through the political order concept, namely in the form of a "new nobility formation," that is, a political elite human material to which special training has been imparted in order then to exercise the actual leadership in the state. Under the influence of racial-biological trains of thought, which however were also fertilized by the conservative national literature of the pre-war period, National Socialism came in a similar way as fascism to the question of this new nobility. The teaching of a political elite is not of German origin, but goes back to Vilfredo Pareto (Lausanne). Actually there already exist forms of an order-like state: Russia and Italy.

The structure of the Russian Soviet system means the complete turning away from Western formal democracy. The Soviet system is a pyramidal structure from the cell to the summit of the state with the help of indirect election. This structure from below is met from above by the summarizing and supervising state will, in which the secret state police (Cheka) plays a special role that is often stronger than that of the Party. This state will expresses itself, in

contrast to Italy where the highest fascist authority determines the final electoral list, in the form of communist terror that already begins in the original cell of the election. This also remains effective in the next higher elections and ensures a gradual "purification" of the Soviets from non-communist components. Russia thus has theoretically a perfected Soviet democracy, practically the dictatorship of an order-like party.

The fundamental ideas of the National Socialist order idea, of a new nobility from blood and soil, which one cannot understand as a secularized Catholicism and a copy of the Catholic order concept on the basis of a romantic misunderstanding of the Teutonic Order and its goals, but also not as a replica of Russian ideas, Rosenberg has clearly expressed in his Marienburg order speech and consistently brought into close connection with the worldview preached by him.

"If we admire in the principle of the Germanic duke and his followers the constantly recurring phenomenon of a great figure in German history, if we recognize in the order principle, in the senate principle, the firm structure for the durability of a state entity, then we must draw the conclusions from this for the twentieth century, that this form must be supported by a worldview which takes leave of bloodless asceticism and returns to the principle that the political leaders of the National Socialist order and thereby also of the German Reich are bound forever to the soil and supported by the blood of their nationhood, so that always new families again arise and from youth on are integrated into the associations of the National Socialist movement, so that instinct, shaping, purposeful will, rational principles also find their representation in living personalities, in a leadership and sub-leadership layer of the German people as large as possible."

These thoughts come to expression more clearly also in an essay by Rüdiger on Othmar Spann (Leadership organ of the Hitler Youth: "Will and Power," Berlin, January 15, 1936):

"The political will springs from the leadership elite anchored in the national community. The Party or as we also say, the order commands the state and is the actual impulse and the dynamic force of the entire state entity. The state must be derived from the political. Therefore the estates of National Socialism have nothing to do with the estates of the old type. Already the reality of the estates formed so far proves that. One should compare the structure of the Reich Food Estate, the Reich Culture Chamber and the German Labor Front once with those hierarchical estates of the Middle Ages and one will find the fundamental difference clearly demonstrated. The estates of National Socialism most closely resemble the medieval guilds. The actual medieval estates, however, for example nobility, clergy and bourgeoisie, which also had political character, are dead and will not rise again despite Spann."

Already the few questions about state and law treated in the foregoing show essential differences of National Socialism compared to the fascist state theory. For even if both represent common ideas over wide stretches, the concepts of race and nationhood in this consistency are foreign to the Italian, also the totality idea is at least politically for the time being not carried through in Italy as it would be possible according to the fundamental books and writings of fascism, so that the position of the Church in Italy can certainly be described as tolerable—a proof that the possibility of cooperation also exists in this state-political system, regardless of the totality form.

What was said conclusively in the two preceding sections on race and nationhood applies partially also to the entire state-political system of National Socialism.

As long as the Christian worldview does not appear excluded from this state and legal formation by a purely this-worldly life formation in the sense of Rousseau's naturalism, the believing Christian could go along with various National Socialist constitutional legal conceptions over wide stretches without thereby getting into difficulties of conscience. When Hans Frank summarizes the National Socialist legal ideal briefly in the words: service to the German people, there is nothing to object to, because a contradiction to Christianity cannot exist at all. Many reforms are also understandable for the unprejudiced observer, since not without reason has the reproach been made to German law that it is above all a jurists' law and less a people's law. Such natured criticism, however, hits only details and not the fundamental. No one will also dispute that the abstract normativism that the reception of Roman law and the liberal constitutionalism of the nineteenth century brought into German legal thinking must be replaced by a concrete legal thinking that is to be determined by a German community order. The dangers also come here only from radicalization or from the revival of liberal ideas.

Characteristic is that the proposals made on the racial foundation for the redesign of a German divorce law (disruption as grounds for fault) show far-reaching similarities with the respective marriage laws of liberal parties (compare Article 142, paragraph 3 of the Civil Code, in Switzerland). No less remarkable is that the principle: "Law is what Aryan men find to be law" (Rosenberg, "Myth," p. 539), literally from Nietzsche, "The Antichrist," Complete Works, VIII, p. 218, has also been taken over by Lenin (Preobrazhenski, "Morality and Class Norms," p. 13, Hamburg 1923) with a skillful reinterpretation for his state-political ideal. ("Everything that serves the Russian people is law, everything that harms it is injustice.")

Fundamental Considerations on the Foregoing Questions:

1. The teaching that only the community means everything is a combative reversal of the individualistic life conception, which however in itself cannot yet create a new order relationship between the individual and the community, but initially only constricts the personality. It does not get beyond "individualism" any more than Marxism gets beyond "liberalism," for it is collectivistic and must, paradoxical as it may sound, end in a mass individualism.

2. Law is not solely the racially conditioned knowledge of what is right, but must have its foundation in the human conscience, which is the same for all, for there are moral conceptions that are common to all peoples and races. It is natural law, the great Decalogue, compared to which also aberrations, other conceptions of individual tribes or of individual persons prove nothing. There are in other words moral basic ideas common to all peoples, whose application to actual life may often be different and difficult, but changes nothing about their binding force. Positive law must receive its norming direction from natural law.

3. The state is not an end in itself, but means to an end. It is something historically become and passes away again historically. Therefore the tasks of the state must not be overstrained so that finally every free stirring of the personality is suppressed, for there are innate rights and also the common good (common benefit takes precedence over self-interest) has its limits. How far these limits of state authority are to be set and how much personal freedom is to be granted to the individual human being, about this the state decides on the basis of natural law and the Christian worldview. From this opposition of intellectual freedom and autonomy of the personality and necessary state compulsion there results only one way out: the compromise, for one can neither extend state authority to the whole

moral realm nor make the state completely value-free from moral postulates.

For liberalism the community is only a sum of individual beings without inherent lawfulness, the state an institution that grants the individual free unfolding of his personality and otherwise bothers him as little as possible. This state doctrine is an overvaluation of the individual. The state concept of National Socialism, on the other hand, overvalues, if not fundamentally, since it does indeed want to include the concept of the creative individual personality, but in the interpretation of various legal teachers, the community and tears it out of the divinely given rank order of things. It asks: What does the individual benefit the state? and thereby determines the value of the human being.

It is explainable as a psychological reaction against the individualistic state conception if some theorists and legal teachers of the new movement formulated the teaching of the totality of the state in a manner that did not seem to do complete justice to the right and dignity of the individual personality as well as to the essence of nationhood. The clarification of ideas is taking place today gratifyingly in the direction that nationhood is regarded as an organic, unfolding unity, as the root from which the state also proceeds, and that the unfolding of the individual personality is judged under the viewpoint of the integration of its achievement into the total culture of the nation. This viewpoint of judgment, which warns against overestimation of the individual, corresponds entirely to the Christian feeling, according to which the individual personality is also only perfected by integrating itself in service to a whole.

The Christian state conception stands opposed to both conceptions, which seeks to tread a golden middle way between the two state-political systems.

It recognizes that the community is something new, something other than only a sum of individuals. The individual being, however, is before the community, is ontologically the primary. Meaning and value comes to human life primarily from how and whether it is shaped according to divine laws. The Christian worldview assigns human being and community back to their natural rank order and thereby first shows their true value, while the two others, in the tendency to overvalue individual or community, actually relativize their value.

Against the assertion that in modern humanity Christianity has already been so far emptied of its religious content that a state structure from Christian substance is no longer possible, must fundamentally be held fast to the possibility of a Christian politics as ideal for a humanity that has become Christian.

4. The state has no directly moral autonomy and independent inherent lawfulness, but must take its guidelines from natural law and the principles of moral ethics; therefore the ideal of Catholic politics is the constant adaptation of positive law to natural law, in order not to end in the boundless.

As much as the turning away of National Socialist state doctrine from individualism and its political expression in liberalism is to be welcomed, on the other hand attention must be drawn to the danger that is now simply given with such an upheaval, that the value of the community is overstrained at the cost of the possibility of action of the individual and the center of gravity is displaced too strongly into the national whole.

5. According to Christian life order the state is also placed into a higher moral order. The final task of the Christian state is to help that its members also reach their final and truest goal: God.

The state is not only a power-bearer, but a lawful life form for establishing the welfare of the totality of its inhabitants, whatever

religion, race and nationality they may belong to; only under this prerequisite does the state according to Hegel represent "the realization of the moral idea." This demand on the state, however, is principally the achievement of the Christian cultural epoch; it rests in contrast to the state concept of antiquity on the view of the equality of all human beings before God and thereby also on the recognition of a sphere of freedom of the individual following from religious relationships within the state and society. Seen ethically, Machiavelli's assertion that the state is only "power" is a confusion of concepts, because power as lawful authority should only come about through binding of conscience.

6. State and nationhood are not identical but different concepts. It would perhaps be better from the standpoint of European peace if Europe could be reshaped into national states, but the völkisch map of Central Europe has been confused for centuries in such a way (compare the conditions in the Danube basin, Czechoslovakia) that without a war a transformation in the sense of the demand that people and state have the same borders is hardly possible. But quite apart from that, seen purely culturally, the coexistence of several nations in the same state territory with greatest mutual freedom would correspond more to the ideal.

More difficult, however, is already the question to examine whether the state stands above the nation. Since the state has become something purely historical and represents a human institution of governments, rulers and peoples with constant fluctuations, a higher rank belongs to nationhood as something given by nature. Thus also states with national minorities are obligated to cultural autonomy (pastoral care and instruction in the mother tongue), because this concerns a natural right whose elimination no power in the world is able to justify, whatever may also be given as motive. Thereby the

word is not spoken for any irredenta, but rather the necessary clarity is created for state obedience, which has limits in natural law.

7. State and Church can actually stand neutral toward each other in the case of separation, which can be either benevolent or hostile to the Church. But the ideal of a people that has become Christian can only be the cooperation of both powers in compromise forms that precisely mirror the fundamental order in the prism of contemporary history.

9. THE TOTALITARIAN STATE, CULTURAL UNITY & EDUCATION.

All racial, national, and constitutional conceptions of National Socialism culminate in the idea of the total state, in which they find their realization. This concept, too, which represents the opposite of the political teachings of the French Revolution, reaches back in its earliest beginnings for decades, one could almost say for a century, if one does not wish to identify it partially already in Greek antiquity. Hegel's philosophy of law and the state and that of his successors is today, though often variously modified or reshaped, becoming reality. In any case, the classical theoretician and state philosopher of this system was Hegel, whose lines of thought substantially influence Fascism and National Socialism, however much the first conception of the state denies this German element in the system. Into these endeavors flow further the state theories of Baron vom Stein, the successors of Hegel, the deification of state authority by the Jewish constitutional theorist Friedrich Julius Stahl, the state theories of the legal positivists who acknowledge no natural law, the circle around von Gleichen with their concepts of "genuine" state authority, and partially also lines of thought from Othmar Spann.

Jacob Burckhardt foresaw many years ago that the culture of "Old Europe" would come to an end, and prophesied a general transformation of political thought, such as in the third and fourth centuries, in which strong individual personalities would exercise their power over the masses that had become devoid of authority, as bearers of a conception of totality. The war has exposed the lie of our humanity and the superficiality of humanization through culture and education. In place of the idealistic humanity that was still the faith of the previous century, there now appear earthly absolutes—communist society, the total state, national character and race—which find their expression in myths and symbols of a new worldview appearing with orthodox claims. Because the irreligious person can no longer give himself value, he takes refuge in national-racial and communist collectives or in the authoritarian state, insofar as he has not already contented himself with the athletic technization of life.

Einseitige interpretations of Christianity by Overbeck, Nietzsche and Burckhardt have also contributed not a little, interpretations that wanted to see the fundamental character of Christianity only in ascetic otherworldly thoughts. "A true Christianity could only maintain itself if it withdrew again to its basic idea of the suffering of this world." The spiritual unity that is the result of Christian humanity but is increasingly being lost is henceforth to be taken over by the authority of the total state, as long as a reawakening of Christian vital forces in the masses does not begin. In place of the spiritual, religious unity comes the uniformity of organized human masses.

Many regard Carl Schmitt as the appointed interpreter of the total National Socialist state, but he sees the ultimate goal of the German Revolution more in a state-as-such with a certain autonomy

of social vital rights. The total state would be only a means to the ultimate end: a corporate state on an estate-based foundation.

The relationship between Church and state in this totality appears peculiarly formulated in the well-known writer Stapel: "To the total state belongs everything that concerns law and morality. To the Church belongs everything that concerns the kingdom of heaven." In other words, in a totalitarian state the state itself is not merely law-creating, but is the ultimate norm of law and morality, so that in a conflict of duties between state and religious conceptions the former would always have preference.

Significantly clearer are the words of Rosenberg in an article "Total State": "What will take place in wider scope is not the so-called totality of the state, but the totality of the National Socialist movement. The state is no longer something that should stand beside the people and beside the movement, but it should be an instrument of the ruling National Socialist worldview. It is therefore advisable for all National Socialists no longer to speak of the total state, but rather of the totality of the National Socialist worldview and of the National Socialist state as the instrument for securing the soul, spirit and blood of National Socialism, as the epochal phenomenon that began in the twentieth century."

No other matter actually follows with such necessity from the idea of race as precisely the demand for the totality of the state, which is ultimately the expression of a particular spiritual attitude. Nevertheless, even here a compromise solution or at least a modus vivendi between Church and state could be found if the political form of totality did not simultaneously represent the realization of an unconditionally non-Christian culture of totality.

Kolbenheyer's admonition to the total state that it should not resort to the mechanistic expedient of command in the cultural

domain is futile as soon as the leadership principle has been acknowledged by it without natural law reservations.

If the Middle Ages partially overstretched the concept of Church and demanded a direct rule of the Church over the state, the modern totalitarian state performs the reverse from its standpoint. The dispute over the indirect or direct power of the Church in worldly matters, which once brought so much unrest to humanity, seems in view of certain modern state theories to be reviving anew. But just as there is no totality of the Church—compare the conception of Bernard of Clairvaux, Pope Boniface VIII, Augustinus Triumphus, de Maistre, Donoso Cortes, as opposed to Augustine and Thomas Aquinas, who designated state and Church as two fully equal societies coordinated with each other—but only of God, so neither can such a totality of the state be justified without falling for the long term into a multitude of difficulties and conflicts of conscience. For Germany something else is added, which must raise serious concerns even from the standpoint of the National Socialist program, which reckons with Christian confessions as historically given facts. Every totalitarian state will necessarily be either confessional or atheistic. The entire development of such a state presses toward this. But if two confessions are present, as in Germany, then the total state idea would of itself push toward a single confession in order to build upon it a state church or Reich church. But no one can eliminate overnight in Germany the historical fact of confessional division. The statesman must rather reckon with its fact for the further future.

Certain dangers of the totalitarian state, which by its nature is centralistic and absolutistic, remain for the Christian conscience, but they diminish if Christian thoughts moderate the claims of the state vis-à-vis the individual personality. The total state, if its ideas are consistently realized, is conceivable only in two forms: as a

hierarchy of priesthood or as a secularized community with a new culture in which the state has become the Church, politics a sacral activity, citizenship a religion, the popular assembly a divine service, the statesman a priest, the leader of the people a saint. This condition would be the end of Christianity and would have its parallel in Russia, even if the Christian churches continued to exist unmolested. The danger of such a totalitarian state would be that the inner atheism would not even come to consciousness in those affected, but rather one would continue to work with the concepts of religion and Christianity as before. It is therefore a great error to think that a political unity and a strong German state without a culture of totality would not be possible for the long term. Precisely the fact that our German people is divided into two confessions admonishes caution, lest in excessive zeal for shaping a new German era one paralyze valuable forces of the nation or transform them into an undesirable opposition.

Totalitarian states strive of themselves toward the total education of the young person. The political transformation of Germany therefore affects no domain with the exception of individual branches of legal and political science as immediately as educational theory, for the new state proclaims a new human type and thereby new principles and forms of education that require a complete reorientation of previous pedagogical thinking. In this sense Ernst Krieck says:

"The total state as expression of national unity, as organ of the national will, is necessarily supreme master of education and the school as of all culture, of the economy, of the orders of life. It determines for educational work the axis and the goal, it supervises the maintenance of direction and of the general level of performance."

Thus by some the demand for a national school with national ethics is already being raised. In this sense the inner

justification of a religious confessional school was already disputed before National Socialism by the Protestant Ernst Krieck and in contradiction to the Church from the Catholic side by Ernst Michel, Weismantel and the Recklinghausen Academy conference of December 28 to 31, 1925.

Here too precise observation of recent decades teaches that this development in Europe and beyond is almost to be called inevitable. The Fascist school reform—Riforma Gentile—also returned by detours to a liberalistic pedagogy when it declared religious instruction necessary for building the student's personality, but rejected all instruction in a particular confessionally bound religion as dangerous, because the spirit would thereby be held fast in an objective determination and hindered in its development. In complete contradiction to the National Socialist program, Karl Schulz expressed the essence of such a German national school with the following words:

"For religious instruction in the usual sense there will be no room in the German national school. We thereby place ourselves on the foundation of Schleiermacher, this acknowledged great German educator toward moral personality. We shall proceed in his sense and thereby serve German faith when in the national school we do not teach theology, but awaken the feeling for religion."

It would be tempting to consider these educational efforts of individual National Socialist pedagogues in connection with the modern secularization of schools up to the demand for an exclusive state school concept, in order by this route to eliminate the influence of the Church on school and education. Wherever this exaggerated state school idea has been realized, the secularization of the school has also made the greatest progress. What Jules Ferry began in France in 1882, Russia and Turkey continue today—law of April 10, 1928—to make the school the exclusive instrument of state

propaganda. In the East Asian countries as well—China since 1928 with the cult of the national-saint statesman Sun Yat-sen—and in the South American countries, the displacement of religious influence has begun in order to achieve a national education. But while Fascism elevated Catholicism to the state religion and built its educational program into national education with the justification that Catholicism was the religion adapted to the Italian genius, this process will not take place in the National Socialist totalitarian state without difficulties, because the national and race represent supreme values. Thus here stand opposed to each other the educational right of the Church and the absolutist claim of the state in the domain of youth formation. According to the papal encyclical Divini Illius Magistri of the year 1929, the Magna Carta of Christian education, there are three original educational powers endowed with ultimate responsibility: the family as the naturally and divinely willed bearer of education, the Catholic Church as the divinely willed bearer of education, and the state as bearer of education. Just as the school does not possess its legal powers from its own sovereign authority but has received them transferred from the primary bearers of education, so too will the state correspond to this rank order in education only when it limits the school to its actual sphere of activity and permits it no encroachments into the sphere of the family and the Church, by guarding against draining family and Church and putting itself in their place, because the actual soul of educational work is religion and only in religious perspective do educational values appear in their true significance.

10. RELIGION, PASTORAL CARE, POLITICS, & POLITICAL CATHOLICISM.

An old problem is unrolled with these questions, one that was not unknown even to the Middle Ages despite its faith. Characteristic are the names: Philip the Fair, Ludwig the Bavarian, Marsilius of Padua and a whole series of ecclesiastical legal scholars who as court theologians stood on the side of the state against the Church.

Thus it was a bitter lament when the bull of Pope Boniface VIII, Unam Sanctam, faced with this problem that no era has yet fully solved, declared: the layman is always enemy to the clergy. One understands that in the political life of the present this entire complex of questions had to be unrolled anew. In the modern state, the people of the Church and the people of the state no longer coincide, their circles intersect widely. These difficulties were known neither to the Middle Ages nor to the age of the Reformation struggles, which despite its opposition to the papacy stood under Christian influence. In the present this atmosphere of faithful inclination toward the invisible world has vanished. Criticism and rejection have become an uncanny matter of course and are propagated. Nietzsche's Zarathustra shakes his head in wonder at the old saints. Modern man knows nothing more of being bounded and called into question by another dimension. Already liberalism has therefore exploited this tension between morality, politics and pastoral care in the modern state for its purposes and has worked especially since the middle of the nineteenth century with the slogans "political Catholicism," "clericalism," "ultramontanism." With National Socialism these difficulties lie in the system as such, for it strives for the unity of party, worldview and culture, and indeed the latter two in the sense of a programmatic worldview. Characteristic are the following words of leading personalities:

"Churches and confessions have nothing to do with the practical things of life, but with those of faith. We leave it to religion to intuit the essence of things and to grasp them dogmatically."

Numerous questions arise quite naturally when such thoughts reach their peak in a world of totality. Again and again it is asserted in these disputes that the struggle is not directed against religion as such, but against the worldly-political power of the Church, which makes the peoples subservient to itself under the cloak of religiosity. But in the total state everything is political, for it is founded on a worldview that encompasses everything and leaves nothing outside. What is political, it alone wants to determine and no one else. The pure inwardness to which the state refers the religiosity of the individual citizen is thereby no longer binding for the shaping of life, for the active, struggling life stands under the laws of another worldview. The Catholic acknowledges the state and its power, but he knows beside the power-political history a sacred history that spiritually transcends the former. Here already begin the first difficulties, because the earthly world appears relativized by the spiritual religious world of Christianity and the ideas of people, state, power and new era are not to be believed as absolute.

In order to give an answer to these questions, one would first have to sharply delimit the problems: What actually is religion and what is its task? How does it manifest itself? Are culture and Christianity two circles that meet only by chance or does not Christianity rather also create culture? Is not every religion culture-forming if it is not oriented in a purely otherworldly speculative manner like Buddhism, which has indeed created magnificent religious monuments but has simultaneously become the cause of sad social conditions for millions of people in the East?

What further is culture and in what relationship does it stand to religion? Is religion the flower, the precondition or the

foundation of culture? In the worldview of National Socialism, culture is "the epitome of all racially conditioned spiritual, emotional and moral values of the people."

What further is politics and in what relationship does it stand to morality, and what actually is its task?

Is there an autonomous morality for politics and culture, a double conscience or an inherent lawfulness? Is politics, even if it were only the conscious shaping of communal life with the means of power of the state, ultimately nevertheless more than an opportunistic attitude that reckons only with sober facts? Alfred Rosenberg clearly emphasizes this close connection between politics and worldview in a lecture "The Unity of Worldview and Culture" that he gave in the framework of Technology Day on February 3, 1935 in the Rheinland Hall in Düsseldorf.

We could ask further:

Does there exist only one moral law that must be applied to all circumstances? Are there completely indifferent actions that lie beyond good and evil? Does the Church have only an indirect influence on temporal matters?

Thereby questions of the greatest depth of impact are touched upon that are more essential for the internal political shaping of a state than all discussions about the fate of associations and organizations: the question of the relationship between politics and spirit, for all politics flows ultimately from some worldview, because the indispensable precondition of every creative politics and the restoration of the true concept of the political in general is faith in transcendental values. Repeatedly in recent decades the Church has raised objections against the intended separation of religion, morality and politics. From Pope Pius IX—Syllabus—to Pius XI runs a straightforward position that leaves no room for doubt. Protestant theologians too recognize increasingly that this

"spiritualization" of religion, Church and public life taken from pietistic circles, especially from the theology of Schleiermacher and his successors, would have to end exclusively with the displacement of Christianity into the innermost fold of private worship of God. The religion of Christ is comprehensive and cannot be a province of spiritual life beside politics, economy and culture, but must signify moral norm for all. Here too one sees how the Protestant liberal concept of Church, which places religion entirely in the transcendental and uncontrollable, works dissolvingly and destructively as soon as the conclusions from its constitutional conceptions are transposed into public life. Thus throughout the entire nineteenth century it has become virtually the fundamental dogma and the fundamental error of liberalism: the total privatization of the religious, from which every influence on "the world" is to be taken, in order to bring about a secularization of the extra-ecclesiastical space. Thereby religion is pressed down to the rank of a "private feeling."

Also by individual Catholic writers—Ernst Michel—views have been represented in recent years that are not compatible with Catholic thought. There is certainly not a Catholic politics, economy, art and culture in the sense that the named domains demand for the Catholic different general laws than for the non-Catholic, but in fact different principles will often apply for the Catholic, for there exists a Catholic politician, economist, artist and bearer of culture who also carries within himself his own ethos.

With all these questions we already come into that problem which is characterized with the name "political Catholicism." It is the most-used slogan of old liberalism, which we already find in the eighteen-fifties. But what is to be understood by it? The extension of ecclesiastical influence to domains that have no direct connection with religion? Confessional party formation that also seeks in public

life, especially in social legislation, a decisive influence of Christianity? Is this word directed against the strong pushing forward of many clerics into public life or only against regrettable missteps in clerical circles that perhaps confused leadership with domineering and opinionatedness? If the subordination of religion to purely political purposes is to be condemned, on the other hand it must be said that a political action from religious-worldview grounds by no means yet signifies a misuse of religion for political purposes. But because politics is essentially more than exploitation of state power, of the stronger will, of calculating intelligence, it reaches quite naturally necessarily into higher spiritual contexts.

Is for the liberals, Marxists and followers of Lenin their worldview really only a private matter that has nothing to do with public life? Why then this effort to transpose their worldview principles into life? Or should an exceptional state be justified only for the believing Christian? It is further human that politicians of Catholic worldview have also occasionally used their influence to obtain party-political or even personal advantages. But not only against such abuse are today's attacks against political Catholicism directed in many cases; when one judges more deeply the problem-setting of our day, one recognizes that political Catholicism today is frequently outlawed because by its nature it is nothing other than the application of Christian principles to public life, thus is more than merely an activity in religious-political border questions. No other worldview is something so unified and self-contained as precisely that of Christianity. This religious being of man designates the complete conclusion of his spiritual existence. It is the highest unified manner of judging all occurrences of life in the light of Christian worldview. The Christian finds himself as bearer of two worlds in a particular responsibility, because vis-à-vis the ultimate goal—God and eternity—everything else, including state and politics, are only

values of the second rank. Religion has to do with politics insofar as the latter reaches into the religious, for between the two exist fundamental and numerous practical relationships. The full separation of both would separate wide domains of life from Christian doctrine and moral teaching.

The history of political confessional parties proves to us moreover that they arose in almost all countries in order to defend the most primitive vital rights of religion against the intolerance of worldview liberalism and the Freemasonry almost always allied with it—Germany, Old Austria, Holland, Luxembourg, Spain, most recently in Italy.

Since the Principal Decree of the Imperial Deputation of the year 1803 brought about the great shift in confessional relationships in Germany to the disadvantage of Catholics, political Catholicism entered as an opposition movement, influenced by Joseph Görres, into the history of the German people in order to defend the Catholic portion of the people, who had been economically, culturally and politically robbed through the mediatization of the ecclesiastical Imperial Estates, against further measures. A glorious history now begins in which all German lands could put forward outstanding Catholic personalities into public life who were by no means narrowed in their national and state-political attitude by their confession. It suffices to recall the Baden native Josef von Buß and the publisher of the Historical-Political Papers, E. Jörg. Bismarck himself was the one who at the end of the Kulturkampf brought this political Catholicism, which in 1870 had given itself the Soest Program as a Christian not purely confessional party, to collaborate in governmental affairs. As great as this history has been over six decades, this political Catholicism never wanted and could never equate itself with the Church, because of the thirty percent of

German Catholics scarcely fourteen percent were also voters of this party.

Political Catholicism is today in Germany overcome by a movement that has proven its historical justification through the heroic and successful struggle against the destructive power of Bolshevism and against the crime of the peace treaties. But precisely because the so-called political Catholicism, with which I personally have never concerned myself, belongs to the past, one can do it justice; and precisely because we wish that the struggle of National Socialism against Versailles and Moscow be brought to a victorious end, we also wish that it leave no embitterment in the German soul. For just judgment it is necessary to visualize the intellectual-historical situation in which political Catholicism arose, and to distinguish between the time of its development in struggle against liberalism and the time that followed the collapse through the World War. The German ascent in the nineteenth century took place under the sign of liberalism and democratic rights, thus an individualistic disposition that, as history has shown, undermined the feeling for community and responsibility in broad strata of the European peoples and made the bourgeoisie in general ripe for an overthrow. The Catholic popular leaders in Germany and Austria used in this situation the available political means of struggle in order to push through their life-view combating liberalism through a metaphysical sense of community, above all in the political and social domain. One of the greatest of these fighters, the Viennese mayor Dr. Karl Lueger, is treated by the leader of the national uprising in his book Mein Kampf virtually as model and teacher. He calls him the greatest German mayor of all times. Beside him towered Baron von Vogelsang and Prince Alois Liechtenstein. The Reich-German leaders Windthorst, Malinkrodt, the Reichenspergers, Schorlemer, Galen, Lieber, Baron von Hertling, Gröber, Pichler, Peter Spahn

belong to the representative figures both of parliamentarism and of Christian social reform. It is correct that in the domain of social reform in Germany two directions developed, a more radical one that stood close to Vogelsang's program, and that of München-Gladbach, which sought merely to reform capitalism but fundamentally acknowledged it, and that the majority of Catholic social politicians in Germany belonged to this second direction. Historical development has passed beyond this direction. But not this circumstance prevented the just appreciation of these politicians, but something entirely different. In the German Reich the politicians of Catholic worldview had to assert themselves against an alliance of liberalism and Protestant-colored state leadership, which had the consequence that the Catholic opposition was combated as an opposition against nation and Reich, although it was naturally a great injustice to doubt the popular and Reich loyalty of the Catholic portions of the people and of the Catholic politicians. This was different in Austria insofar as here fairly soon—admittedly after a wearing struggle for Lueger against liberal supremacy—the correct relationship between a religious-social reform movement and the conservative power-holders of the state prevailed. To be sure, also in Austria the Christian Social movement ended in a compromise with ruling capitalism. This circumstance and the relegation of the national thought necessitated by circumstances in the multi-ethnic Reich of the Habsburgs had ideologically weakened the Christian Social Party when it faced after the collapse a situation that differed in Austria even much more from the pre-war period than in the German Reich. We come hereby to the second phase of political Catholicism, to the time after the collapse. The German Reich then threatened to disintegrate through the unbridgeable opposition between the liberal, individualistically disposed right-wing parties and the Bolshevik-infiltrated left-wing parties. It was politically

necessary first to hold the Reich together as well as possible. To this political Catholicism in the German Reich contributed in decisive fashion, for it alone was capable of coalition in two directions. Under foreign-political pressure the party coalition emerging from the overthrow had to engage first in the fulfillment policy. This policy was a burden and had to have an end sometime. The question now was which power would bring it to an end. The passionate movement of National Socialism proved to be this power. That with the breakthrough of the radical national resistance the party coalition also fell that was connected with the fulfillment policy, that was historical fate. The circumstances were somewhat different in Austria. The Christian Social Party was as a result of its past, its activity in the multi-ethnic Reich, not sufficiently prepared for the elementally erupting national idea. Seipel has the merit of having promoted, with all emphasis on an Austrian state idea, a community of conviction of all parties in preparatory work for the future great German Reich, but of having rejected for worldview reasons cooperation with the extremely radical Austrian socialism. From Seipel also comes the famous program: Every combination with the Reich, none without the Reich. In Austria there already existed after the collapse the natural national-Christian Social coalition. That there it did not come immediately after the breakthrough of 1933 to the natural Christian-National Socialist coalition—one will be able to think and judge calmly about this when the sad fraternal strife has once been overcome. And to this the considerations of this book also want to contribute.

It would therefore be a debt of honor for the Catholic historians of Germany, especially to write the history of German Catholicism since the end of the World War. The reproach of international disposition, of intermingling of the political and religious and of a constant dependence of Catholic parties on the

Vatican and much else would collapse into nothing, and the few unpleasant personalities and phenomena within its history could not weaken the permanent substance of the entire state-political and social achievement that went forth from this iron phalanx to the German Reich and beyond. Men like Windthorst, Malinkrodt, the Reichenspergers, Schorlemer, Galen, Löwenstein, Ballestrem, Lieber, Hertling, Gröber, Kiene, Orterer, Pichler, Peter Spahn, Lueger, Seipel shine for all times not only as ornaments of world Catholicism but also as ornaments of German patriotism and German statecraft. If one could speak of errors—which party has remained free from the human and all-too-human?—then it would be only that of the "missed opportunity" to preserve the national movement from worldview radicalisms and religious surrogates and to lead it into a conservative and Christian-national politics. Precisely in the turbulent times that Europe is experiencing today, the great and permanent successes of political Catholicism should not be forgotten. If the revolution of the year 1918 was overcome relatively quickly, the constitutional condition established and the agitated stream soon guided again into a bed of order, reason and law, this is substantially to be credited to the collaboration of political Catholicism in Germany. That this occurred within the then-only possibility, parliamentary democracy, was not the fault of the Catholics, for in the National Assembly of the year 1919 worldview liberalism of socialist and bourgeois stamp had the overwhelming majority. The balanced judgment of history will one day establish that this today-rejected "political Catholicism," however much it was a matter bound to the times, could preserve Germany from many errant paths of radical elements, as long as precisely a strong state authority was not possible, which National Socialism has given to the German people. Doubtless great dangers were connected with the drawing of Catholicism into political party life, to which also individual

representatives succumbed, because the secularization and consideration of things purely from the perspective of the politically profane could also reach over by way of the party into religion itself.

Thus it was also a natural phenomenon accompanying every political movement that also within the Center two directions developed, a conservative—monarchical-patriotic—and a more social-democratic-liberal oriented one, but the connection of political Catholicism with the Marxists, however much it has been regretted and also condemned from the fundamental standpoint, was not only attributable to this left-directed wing within the Center, but was rather grounded in the distressing fact that the bourgeois political parties in the state parliaments and in the Reichstag completely failed in worldview questions and were far more intolerant than the Marxists, of whom not a few were by no means revolutionaries but showed much agreement with the English Labor Party. Missteps may never be charged to a cause as such. Between ideal and reality there always yawns an abyss because every person, even more a party, always falls short of its own best powers. As no one condemns National Socialism because it had to tolerate a Röhm group within itself for years, so let no one break the staff over political Catholicism because in certain decisions, especially in national regard, it did not demonstrate greater foresight and more elasticity of movement.

But especially must the slogan of political and religious Catholicism be rejected here, which in its ultimate conclusions, if it is consistently thought through and transposed into life, leads to a dogmatic heresy. Although the former Protestant and later convert Reinhold Baumstark, who distanced himself from the Center since the founding of the Reich and of which he was a deputy for several years, has himself always remained a faithful son of the Church, he has nevertheless in excessive zeal and as a result of lacking essential understanding of the problems done harm through this attitude.

Whoever sees in politics applied morality will never be able to admit two completely separate spheres—politics and religion—or the right of a double conscience, if he does not wish to arrive finally with the distinction between a political and religious Catholicism in the dead end of a heresy. Therefore the combating of political Catholicism benefits neither the Church nor the nation nor religiosity in general, but only the opponents of a Christian culture in public life. In fact, politics without dogma begins with the Tractatus Theologico-Politicus in which the Jew Spinoza pressed Christianity down to a historically transient phenomenon without lasting values and ultimate normative forces. Just as there is a Christian culture, which is nothing other than the relation of all things to the center point, the subordination of secondary goods to the supreme good, the rescue from fragmentation, so too there must be a Christian politics, that is, the ordering of things of public life according to the laws of Christian justice and love. Let us not overlook this connection between politics and struggles of ideas. For the long term there are no worldview-indifferent states or parties. With the entry of Christ into human history, all action is a taking of position for or against him. All politicians and statesmen have a particular creed that is derived from religion, modern philosophy or from currents of the times. More important than all politics therefore is the reconstruction of the world of conscience. If we want to emerge from the chaos of the present, there is only one possibility: to restore the hierarchy of life values and thereby to bring politics under morality. It is also considered from the perspective of the history of ideas completely falsely seen when one sees the deep meaning of the present in the depoliticization of the Church and in the ecclesiasticization of religion, which would have begun with the French Revolution and following secularization, to end with the demise of the Papal States and the elimination of ecclesiastical parties. Certainly pastoral care

today has a much greater significance than earlier, the space of houses of God works more sacrally, the eternal light in the churches speaks to the people of our day more of the value of the soul and of the inner person than in epochs of prosperity, of orderly political conditions—but all this comes not from the demise of political Catholicism but from the fact that people, disgusted by the politicization of all life, flee into the innermost sanctuary of their soul. Need has therefore in the past created political Catholicism, that is, a political representation of Catholics in public life. Just as the arising is historically conditioned, so too was the duration of its existence temporally limited. In the moment when the state itself undertakes the guarantee for religious freedom of conscience, the existence of such parties has become superfluous. But even when no separate political parties exist any longer, the task of the Church vis-à-vis public life would not be ended if it wants to preserve and deepen the Christian character of peoples and states. The Church cannot possibly be indifferent toward public life if it does not, like Buddhism or like so many spiritualistic sects of the Middle Ages, place the center of gravity of its tasks exclusively in another world or if one does not want to understand Christianity in a purely eschatological manner. Thus everything condenses into the question of the correct relationship between religion and culture, state and Church. If this entire question forms such a difficult problem, it is understandable that no one has yet found a universally valid practical formula. The delimitation of jurisdictional domains for religion and culture and in further effect for Church and state has always remained a problem that no era has yet fully solved, and will also always remain a problem. Without doubt many errors have also been committed in the Catholic camp during the last sixty years. The political ascent of Catholicism was not always connected with that tact and restraint that a strong anti-Christianity demanded. The

development of organizations perhaps occurred too quickly and vehemently, without that slow natural growing forth, without organic connection with the past. Also the political instinct for the national awakening, for the world of thought of the growing youth, was not seldom lacking. It was further a deeply regrettable error that finally also pastoral care with its purely religious organization was drawn into the ugly struggle of party politics. Thus the center of gravity of Catholic life was often placed in organization and external work. One has spoken not unjustly of a primacy of the political in the Catholicism of Central Europe. One consoled oneself with representation in the parliamentary bodies and evaluated Catholicism according to the number of deputies. One not seldom identified in many Catholic circles Church and religion with party and political systems, while the Church can only help and support insofar as purely religious interests and not political matters are concerned, in which everyone must have freedom of decision. It is therefore in politically tense times not always just a disadvantage when the Church is withdrawn from political struggle in order better to utilize the supernatural vital forces of religion and in a time of oppositions to stand above the noise of everyday life. Whoever serves the eternal and through a capable pastoral care religiously penetrates the hearts of believers has created the best precondition also for the continued existence of Christianity in public life. Political priestly fighting natures and the Gospel are contradictions and irreconcilable concepts. The Church through its pastoral care can support political systems when they are worldview-necessary and useful, but it may never identify itself with these, much less allow itself to be synchronized with party politics. The perspectives of both may perhaps coincide for certain stretches, but politics thinks in a narrow space, the Church must be universal-pastoral, that is, serve all. Religion and politics are admittedly never or at least extremely rarely

to be completely separated from each other. A strict separation of both is already therefore not possible because the religious conscience sinks into all realms of human life. There can therefore be for a convinced Christian no double conscience, a national, political-state conscience and a religious one. This conception would be incompatible with Christianity.

Considered from the perspective of the history of ideas, the attempt at a fundamental separation of religion, pastoral care and politics and thereby also the phrase "political Catholicism" goes back to the Protestant, purely spiritualistic concept of Church, which Luther already taught and which later theology under the influence of Schleiermacher shaped increasingly one-sidedly into an opposition between state and Church. But what we need more necessarily today than ever in the past are Christians for whom religion is a reality that reaches further than the incense of the church is fragrant, for whom the Gospel is more than a formality, in other words the age of the early Church would have to become alive again, in which it was not yet a social matter of course to be a Christian, but a blood-drenched path led to the baptismal font. Hitler has spoken a correct word—Mein Kampf, page 424—that one can also apply to the Catholicism of the present if it wants to work in shaping the world:

"Every worldview, it may be a thousand times correct and of the highest benefit for humanity, will remain without significance for the practical shaping of a people's life as long as its principles have not become the banner of a fighting movement."

11. ROME & THE GERMAN PEOPLE; NATIONAL CHURCH MOVEMENTS; ROMANISM & CATHOLICISM

The views of many leading National Socialist writers in this field concern a series of questions that have repeatedly occupied Protestant research since the middle of the 19th century. In the final analysis, however, everything comes down to two questions contained in these two concepts: Rome and Germanness.

When one examines the various authors who have taken positions on this in their ultimate contexts, one recognizes further that it is not merely a struggle over Catholicism, ultimately over Christianity as an allegedly foreign intrusion into the German character, but that the entire question is broadened into an intellectual confrontation between Germanic and Roman-Latin culture in general, so that in a certain respect the ancient struggle of the Germanic tribes under Arminius against Rome seems to find its continuation today. One could briefly characterize this old problem of Rome and Germanness through the following names: Widukind, Charlemagne, Boniface; Hohenstaufen, Gregory VII; Luther, Jesuits; Habsburg, Prussia; Potsdam, Aachen (Vienna).

Can one speak of a racially determined necessary opposition of the German nation to Rome? Does the anti-Roman sentiment actually accompany all those epochs of German history that must be designated as the awakening of national feeling? Is Arminius or his brother Flavus the symbol of the Germanic attitude? Many might consider it superfluous to pose such questions at all after a millennium of German Christian history, since no one can turn back the wheel of history. But the German Faith Movement has nestled itself into these trains of thought with skillful tactics in order to work toward a spiritual coordination of nation and ancient Germanic religious culture in the sense of the deification of blood and race, although in the National Socialist program, if one does not understand Article 24 incorrectly, hardly any basis for this can be found, and Hitler himself in his work "Mein Kampf" rejected this

conclusion with the sharpest words. Unfortunately, it was compounded by the fact that in recent decades Catholic circles, unwilling to separate themselves from the tendentious portrayals of Tacitus, not infrequently underestimated the ancient Germanic, thus the indigenous national culture, and overestimated the Latin-Roman world. This regrettable fact had to be felt with justification in nationally minded German circles as a provocation and therefore significantly increase the opposition to Rome. The preference for Greek and Roman culture that began with Winckelmann has incidentally also clouded the vision of many non-Catholic German scholars regarding the greatness and significance of ancient Germanic prehistory in Germany. Instead of immersing themselves lovingly in this past, which from a moral perspective undoubtedly stood higher than the culture of the religiously and ideologically declining Roman Empire, they constructed a history, supported by Tacitus and Roman sources, that taught German youth the Roman view, as if the ancient Germans had been nothing but barbarians. Had the Germans not possessed something fresh and great natural virtues, their entry into the sinking Roman cultural world, and even less their success in founding the Occident, would be inexplicable. On the other hand, it must not be overlooked that national circles have also gone too far in their emphasis on pre-Christian Germanic culture and could no longer objectively judge the Christian era.

The Christianized antiquity, these writers explain, has brought about a tremendous concealment of the Germanic German character. The religious soul of the Germanic peoples has been buried by the historical development brought by Rome. A dangerous undertaking!

Similar national-cultural movements are already showing themselves in Japan, Hungary, Mexico, in Turkey, where with the help of pantheistic trains of thought a racially appropriate national

culture is being built up in which the values of Christian supernature must become a foreign world.

In all these trains of thought, Rome appears again and again precisely as the great counterpole to strong national cultures. But since Greek and Roman ancient culture has entered into that of the Occident with not insignificant components, this struggle in the European sphere becomes simultaneously one against the idea of a Christian Occident.

From the abundance of problems given by the question of Rome and the German people, only very few can be selected here. I have treated a large part of them in my preceding writings: "Rome, Christianity, German People" and "German People and Christian Occident." Various questions are also answered in the fifth section of this book, "The Problem of Racial Influence in the Development of Occidental Christianity." Undoubtedly, however, the modern struggle over Rome has posed new welcome tasks for Catholic scholarship to examine the entire relationship of Rome as a cultural-religious-political symbol to the German nation. Important would be a history of German Catholicism in the sense of Janssen, but with constant consideration of present problems; likewise, a history of German theology should soon be written to investigate the great share of the Germanic cultural sphere in the development of Christianity in the Occident, which is not infrequently underestimated by the Romance peoples. When the official office for Reich history has also established its own department for researching national church movements in Germany, there lies in this an admonition to German Catholic scholarship to take up these serious questions, which today torment countless young, capable people, into the sphere of its own research.

It is primarily a matter of three fundamental programmatic positions that constantly recur in the treatment of the question

"Rome and the German people," substantially influence the entire view of religion and history, and which are already found, more or less clearly formulated as "anti-Roman sentiment," in Lagarde, Chamberlain, and Artur Bonus. Noteworthy is how deeply today the race and national idea has sunk into these questions even among non-German-speaking peoples. Like an intellectual influenza, these thoughts move through the world today. We find similar demands and interpretations in Mexico, where Christianity is fought with the nationalist intention of reviving the ancient culture of the Aztecs and Mayas; in Peru the time of the Incas is glorified; in Japan there are similar efforts of Shintoism that portray all foreign influences as hostile and harmful to the Japanese people.

a) Are there actually two essentially different types of piety, a Germanic-Nordic and a southern Roman one?

Rosenberg says: Rome is of lower race and simultaneously rigid! Günther, however, describes the essence of German piety with the following thoughts:

"The Nordic upper stratum of the Indo-Germanic peoples is oriented only toward this world (Indo-Germanic piety is that of bodily-spiritual health), is proving oneself against fate, not religiosity of fear and consciousness of sin or self-condemnation, but immediate relationship to God without the intermediary of the priesthood, with the urge toward mutual friendship between the divine and the human in the sense of Plato and pantheism. German piety knows no fear, no passive waiting for grace, no redeemer or savior idea, no duality (dualism) between body and soul; it is life harmony in the sense of Goethe's conception of life," with a distinctly heroic character of a masculine, soldierly activism with the glorification of life, in which the proving of masculine and knightly virtues in daily struggle appears more important than the "truly individualistic concern" for securing an existence in the beyond. Compared to this

piety rooted in heroic humanity of Aryan stamp, as it speaks from the testimonies of Greek spirit and Germanic culture, the religions that have intruded from Asia are "pale, life-hostile constructions."

In a similar way, Kolbenheyer attempts to displace a "dogmatic" system of the Roman Church through a racially (biologically) grounded religion. But whoever thinks these trains of thought through consistently would naturally have to conclude that the racial difference of peoples is of decisive importance not only for religious experience but also for metaphysical truth. In other words, the consequence would be a relativism of knowledge as well!

Into these conceptions reach the trains of thought of the Tübingen Professor Hauer, who in his programmatic Berlin speech on October 18, 1934, explained the concept of "religious primal will" that he had coined and among other things proclaimed:

"Race and faith belong most closely together and cannot be separated. The opposite view is combated by the German Faith Movement as destructive in both the religious and biological sense, because it underestimates or even dismisses as unworthy and hindering for religious life the reality of blood as a creative power that is simultaneously our destiny...

When we want to newly ground the intellectual culture of Germany from faith, we must set forth as guidelines the great laws of what happens in life, but not a dogma. There will certainly always be a community of Jesus. But the other question, whether Christianity should stand as the normative power at the center of the religious life of Germany, is answered differently by the German Faith Movement when it declares: that Christianity stands as the central normative power in the German people is an episode of German history, and this episode is coming to an end."

An entire school is already working in this sense to carry over the race idea to the cultural field in full opposition to the

National Socialist program and to determine the essence of Germanic piety, whereby a preference for the worldview of the Greeks and Aryans in general and an ever stronger rejection of Christianity as a religion of the beyond emerges.

This racially German piety, which lacks any understanding for the moral heroism of will given in Christianity, is, when seen more closely, nothing other than a tremendous self-deception, a self-fraud, a dogma-less pantheism with echoes of German idealism. The reality of the Nordic person is also different. The power of sin cannot be argued away from our existence through artificially constructed types of piety. Precisely in this Christianity proves itself to be completely true to life, in that it teaches people to see again and again the reality of original guilt and sin in its terribleness. We are experiencing today what this "natural" man is, and will experience it even more terribly when the further conclusions are drawn. But Christian teaching does not deceive people about this reality; rather it opens their eyes, without thereby distorting the sense of honor and weakening a primal natural force. Humility is not servitude but clear knowledge of oneself; original sin is not Semitic fantasy but sad fact, which even religious-historical research cannot deny away, however much Schnitzer strives to provide this proof.

From these constructions of German piety speaks a complete misunderstanding of the essence of Christianity, which like no other religion on earth presupposes the greatest heroism of will in order to conquer and maintain the supernatural. Christianity bears no feminine sentimental traits and no phenomena of decline of weary cultures. Completely unjust is also the interpretation represented by this literature of the Christian virtues of humility and love, as if both were nothing other than weakness, baseness of disposition, servility and cadaver obedience, which are certainly not worthy of German men. It rests on a complete misunderstanding of

the concepts of honor and humility, both of which are rooted in the same depth of soul and have given wonderful blossoms of heroism to humanity especially in the heroic life of so many Christian saints. Only he who takes Christianity seriously and wants to translate it into life experiences how difficult it is to be a Christian in modern life, how much renunciation and sacrifice are necessary to maintain the religious high level. Christianity is judged by these constructors of racially appropriate religion often only according to externalities and historical ballast, instead of according to its deep life forces. No one denies differences in religious thinking among peoples that are conditioned by character, language, race, and landscape. Christianity as a world religion can substantially bridge and balance these differences through the dogmas common to all, through the all-encompassing organization and unified liturgy, yet it has never from the beginning made it its task simply to eradicate or coordinate everything that blossoms forth from good national character. Thus there have always been differences in architectural style, in mysticism, which despite its supernatural character can be bound to the people, in religious folk customs; even in theology, German and Romance writers do not always take the same paths, however much they come together in dogmatic matters. The forms of piety of the Catholic Nordic person do not coincide in every respect with those of southern peoples, despite common dogmatic foundations. But whoever considers the racial and ethnic differences more deeply will come to the conviction that the individual nations are culturally and religiously positively dependent upon one another and that this harmonization process can only receive that realization which is at all possible among human beings in a world church, but not in a national church. Light is distributed among peoples, and only through excessive tension is the national character falsified.

Nordic piety is distinguished by seriousness, depth, inwardness, moral strictness, capacity for mystical immersion, intellectual creative power. What is characteristic of the German is: the restless thinking, pondering and seeking, the Faustian. Then the iron, persistent will and finally his astonishing organizational ability.

But German piety is threatened by the danger of despising form and order, of making the conviction of the individual the absolute judge, of sacrificing objective truth even to the erroneous conscience, of falling into religious subjectivism and rebelling against the claim of a religious authority.

Southern Romance piety possesses a particular simplicity and uncomplicated nature of thinking, intellectual clarity, humble faith, integration into the community of the Church, the will to form and order, and the courage for the unquestioning ultimate surrender to God. Not without reason is it said that the Romance person is by nature religious-Christian, even when an abyss yawns between outward piety and moral conduct.

But Romance piety is constantly accompanied by the danger of overestimating reason, that form becomes formula and finally replaces inner conviction, by the danger of rigidity and externalization, of intellectual shallowness and religious frivolity.

If only one of these two forms of piety prevailed in the Church of God, then that would be impoverishment, for each harbors values that the other lacks. If both forms of piety stood beside each other without mediation, then the opposition would be difficult to bear and could lead to discord.

However one may think about the allegedly violent introduction of Christianity into Germany a thousand years ago and the associated disorientation of Germanic disposition to piety—in any case, the Germany of that time had no effective religious force to oppose Christianization—one must nevertheless respect and accept

the now millennium-old struggle of Germanness with Christianity for its Germanization as German destiny. Gustav Paul rightly says:

"If the paganism of the Germans, whose heroic features are sympathetic and should not be disputed, had been internally superior to Christianity, it would simply have triumphed over it. In reality, however, it was precisely the reverse... Christianity was towering above the Germanic religion... It is therefore not correct that Christianity broke the life force of the Nordic race."

Christianity has incidentally in German lands been increasingly Germanized and actualized for more than a thousand years. No religious worldview of antiquity passed so organically, so smoothly and imperceptibly into Christianity as the Germanic one. With none did less unresolved sediment, fewer irrational remainders survive. Even the ancient pre-Christian religious conceptions of God of the Germans have penetrated into Christianity—not only into Protestantism—and have repeatedly transformed it and assimilated it to themselves and to the national spirit. In German Christianity of today, without doubt, more of the pre-Christian knowledge of God of the ancient Germans lives than we could still know and experience about this knowledge in any other way. One overestimates the alienation of Germanness through Christianity. It was not German mysticism that was the first German metaphysical creative will, but Christianity was already Germanized at the first contacts with the Nordic tribes.

Since the Heliand poet, who like Gottschalk signifies an overwhelming of the Mediterranean by the German spirit, since Meister Eckhart and the great mystics to Romanticism, the best treasure of the German soul has been forged together with Christianity into an indissoluble unity for a millennium in faith and thought, in German poetry and German painting, German architecture and German music.

But whoever does not want to admit these facts would first have to give a clear unambiguous answer to the question: What is German at all?

No one denies the elective affinity and natural kinship of the German spirit with the Greek (Greeks and Germans are Indo-Germans), but the urgent question arises for what reasons the acceptance of Greek-Roman-determined Christianity by the Germanic peoples became possible at all. Two explanations are given for this today: Either these peoples possessed such an undeveloped consciousness of themselves and their law of life that they fell prey to the richly articulated new religious culture without regard to whether it corresponded to them most deeply or not, or—the other possibility—the acceptance rested on a felt superiority of the "foreign" religion over their own, on an objective higher value of the adopted culture by the peoples "barbaric" in the Roman sense. Can one detect a resistance of the Germanic religious mentality to Christianity preached by Rome in German intellectual history up to the 16th century? This conception of a burial of Germanic-German character contradicts rather entirely the manner in which Rome was received in Germania. A violent penetration of Germanic and Christian life values could never have led to new strong and living forms.

Seen from the perspective of the history of peoples, one would have to ask further: Is Nordic a spiritual attitude originally connected with all Indo-Germanic peoples? Then naturally all these peoples would have to participate in this spirit. It would again only remain questionable how the acceptance of the "foreign" Christianity could come about. But if one limits the concept of the "Nordic" biologically, then in view of the racial mixture of European peoples one would not understand how the 7% of Nordic people that

Germany still counts today could give character to a new dawning world age.

Even Martin Wähler, who writes in a collection that is entirely built on the alienation theory of Günther and Hauer, must admit that the investigation of religious national character from the racial standpoint still lacks any firm scientific foundation, so that serious scholarly circles stand thoroughly opposed to it in justified skepticism. No people can reject everything foreign, because tribes, races, and nations in the plan of creation and also according to sober science, which permits no apodictic judgments, are dependent upon one another in order to found high cultures of religious or secular kind. Many former foreign goods have taken on the color and taste of German soil in their adoption by the people and in centuries-long use. A healthy people only adopts what corresponds to its character. What has been valued and practiced for centuries by the majority of the people, like Christianity, must have also corresponded to the character of the people. That superstition was a foreign imported good from the East, no one will believe who knows ancient Germanic religion and takes into account the historical fact that in few other lands were witch persecutions, popular superstition, and spirit cult so widespread as precisely in German-speaking territory.

It is an illusionistic historiography that views everything under the teleology of a falsely understood National Socialism and in anti-Roman sentiment when even respected German scholars answer the question about the essence of the German person with the "beautiful sense" of the Edda, the "high courage" of the Nibelungenlied and the Hohenstaufen knights, with the "penetration to the deep layer of a personal experience of God" and the "restlessness of the soul."

Whoever digs deeper in the authoritative literature that treats the concept of German piety and cares for its popularity

recognizes that these discussions ultimately concern the rejection of original sin, of the mediating position of the Church, and of the papal primacy of the Roman Church, which allegedly do not correspond to German character. The overemphasis on the heroic political life ideal, in which the bearers of future German national strength, military power, economy, culture, and state leadership are to be educated, leads to a Germanic Pelagianism that expects everything from the purely natural life force of German national character freed from all racial bondage and sees in heroic fighting spirit the particular moral endowment of the Nordic racial soul. Toward such biologism, Christianity with its teaching of sin and redemption, grace and sacraments would indeed have to appear as an unheroic Semitic myth and as magism.

The intellectual fathers of such an interpretation of Christianity for the Germans, however, were not National Socialists, but Nietzsche, Chamberlain, and Lagarde, although on the Catholic side as well Thomas Hecker (New York) and Hermann Schell (Würzburg) praised an "activist" ideal of virtue.

Whoever thinks through these conceptions consistently must precisely designate the millennium of German history in Christianity as an aberration of our people and absolutely reject Rome, according to which, as the center of Catholicism, it has been the main bearer and exponent of the Christian movement in all centuries.

Extremely gratifying is it to see that in response to these assertions, respected Protestant and Catholic scholars in objective research come to the same results in the correct assessment of the relationship of Rome, Christianity, and Germandom. Only political reasons and nothing else led the Saxons to struggle against the Christian missionaries. No one has yet provided proof that the Christianization of Germany brought about a change in Germanic

character. The adoption of Christianity by the Germanic peoples occurred neither violently nor was it itself a violation of the German soul, but rather a mutual fertilization and penetration of ancient Christian spirit and Germanic sensibility. The poet of the "Heliand" was no less a genuine German than the ancient Germanic priests who sang cult songs in praise of Wotan.

Germandom is at all only one, though probably the strongest, of the many sources from which the stream of German life is fed. Already Haller ("Epochs of German History") has emphasized with emphasis that one must not equate Germans and Germans, if only because the Germans in the totality of Germanic peoples (including the English!) do not yet constitute half. More decisive than this numerical relationship seems the fact that much of what we today regard as an essential component of Germanness was not at all contained in Germandom. I mention among these only the first point in the program of National Socialism: the German idea of unity, which was fought for centuries by all German tribes, not only by the princes but by the people, and when it was temporarily realized, was always destroyed again. Characteristic of the Germanic tribes, for whose distinction from the Roman population the word barbarians was coined, is the absence of a unified name as well as a unified cultural will that would have enabled them to successfully counteract the disintegration of Roman culture in the sense of a synthesis and to create a national empire. Only in Christianity did it succeed to bridge this hatred with which the old German tribes mutually persecuted one another through a spiritual religious unity. This historical merit of the Christian religion on German-speaking territory can be denied or weakened by no researcher. In the closing speech of the Nuremberg Party Rally of 1935, the achievements of Christianity for German national formation were therefore fully

recognized by the authorized interpreter of the National Socialist program.

b) Was the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation a serious damage to national historical development?

Since around the middle of the 19th century Heinrich von Sybel, in contradiction to other scholars, especially to Ficker, designated the Italian policy of the German kings as an aberration, this section of history encompassing a millennium has been fought with a passion as if all the misfortune in the German people were traceable only to this entanglement of religious and political ideas that would have begun with the coronation of the Frankish King Charlemagne.

After the struggle over the personality of Charlemagne has already been decided by Adolf Hitler himself in the sense of the earlier popular view, the struggle over the interpretation of the first Reich continues all the more fiercely. In Sybel and Ficker, and this applies up to the present leading National Socialist historical research, there stand opposed not only two different scholarly interpretations of German history, but the Prussian view of history, which transfers its state-political goals to the Middle Ages, and the universal, overall German attitude of the Viennese scholar Ficker. Not a few German writers view the Roman-German imperial idea precisely as a damage to the German idea of unity, although they cannot deny that with the transfer of the Roman crown to the German people, the leadership position in European history was also connected. Hand in hand with this goes a harsh polemic against the ruling house of the Habsburgs, which carried this crown for over four centuries but is designated today as the arch-enemy of Germanness. With a passion that one seldom finds elsewhere, this dynasty is fought, although no other empire pushed the German cultural idea so far toward the south and east as precisely this one (cf.

the German settlements in Hungary, Yugoslavia), and although Germanness culturally never occupied such a powerful position in Central Europe as precisely in the old multinational monarchy, in which every high official spoke German and was therefore also forced to take a position on German culture, which has substantially changed since 1918 in the successor states.

This struggle against the idea of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation has furthermore for several decades been accompanied by a purposeful emphasis on the particular cultural achievements of Protestantism, compared to which those of the Catholic population segment and thus of the entire Catholic Middle Ages are designated as insignificant. Whoever carefully examines the works of the leading men who prepared this mentality of National Socialist literature recognizes that in the evaluation of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, Greater German and Lesser German historical conceptions stand opposed to one another and the rejection of Rome is a deliberately predetermined conscious tendency. This is already indicated by the catchwords under which these discussions about the imperial idea are conducted: centralism versus federalism; universal politics versus national politics; empire versus state; Roman-Christian-Occidental versus German-national-Protestant-Prussian; the close entanglement with the Church and the wearing struggles between Pope and Emperor were disastrous for the development of the German state and people; they prevented the German-national unitary state, weakened the imperial power and involved the Germans in endless plans; particularist efforts were strengthened, foreign political struggles carried into domestic political life, the German people made hostile with the other peoples, the western border endangered.

Often under this historical view, ultimately only those emperors of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation are

recognized as national who found themselves in a political opposition to Rome, even if in their family life they by no means could embody the ideal of German character. On the private life of so many German rulers of the Middle Ages who are today designated as pioneers of the present, deep shadows fall from a Christian perspective.

Frederick II was also nothing less than German. It is a legend to attribute to him, who loved the south more than his German homeland, a national disposition. Henry IV and Louis the Bavarian are also not free from great flaws as characters. But whoever is able to detach himself from subjective emotional moments and judges this millennium of German-Italian history from a high vantage point must tell himself that the medieval struggle between Emperor and Pope, however much human elements played into it on both sides, was not caused by clerical lust for power or anti-German disposition of the Roman clergy, but that mostly quite different, deeper-lying problems stood behind it. In any case, the question is not settled whether in these medieval confrontations between Rome and Germanness, oppositions of Roman and German state-church conceptions (Saxons, Schwabenspiegel) were also operative. Perhaps it would have been better if instead of the illusion of the Roman-German imperial crown, the domestic political unity of the German tribes had formed the state ideal of the rulers of that time; however, no one can turn back the wheel of history according to the desirabilities of today and demand that the state policy of that time should have been made according to the conceptions of later centuries. Numerous reasons, which by no means lie in religious areas, caused the German princes of the Middle Ages to march to Italy and undertake Roman campaigns: consideration of similar efforts by the French and English, the leading position in the politics of Europe, the close economic relationships of both lands. In any

case, the great plan to win the Slavs for the Reich could only be realized according to the circumstances of that time with Rome and not in opposition to the Roman Curia. Nothing proves this better than the policy of Otto the Great and the founding of the Archbishopric of Magdeburg. Without the Roman policy of the emperors, the eastern colonization would soon have collapsed. East and West Prussia, Courland and Livonia later became simultaneously German and Christian. Perhaps, seen thus, the founding of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation is the only great world-political deed that has succeeded for the German people to this day. Nothing is so characteristic as the fact that none of the German princes rebelled against the role that history then assigned to the Germans in Italy. To all, rather, the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation was self-evident faith and pride. It is therefore inadmissible to project our present political viewpoints into the past in order to judge it accordingly. Neither Widukind, whose name is entered in the Martyrologium Germanicum, nor the Guelph are suitable as national heroes, because both remained enemies of the German idea of unity and particularists of a tribal rule and dynastic power politics. The great Germanic conception in Charlemagne's empire, in which the subjugation of the Saxons was a "political necessity," found its complete realization only because it was conceived too greatly for one generation. Thus we stand before the undeniable fact that Charlemagne, whom Leopold von Ranke also calls the executor of world history, is more deeply rooted in the heart of the German people than his opponent Widukind. Charlemagne was more world-embracing; the legendary cycles of many peoples concern themselves with him, from the Orient to Iceland his spiritual energies reach; Widukind has never become a spiritual power outside his old domain, the Lower Saxon region; he did not even grasp the entire German national soil, and his tribesman who remained pagan

contributed not the slightest to the German colonization of Slavic space beyond the Elbe. It was furthermore a self-evident consequence that in the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, in which different peoples and races were bound into cultural and political unity, only the state idea of ancient Rome could have justification. From this coexistence of different nations in the same political space, Germanness finally also gained essential advantages in all cultural fields.

Never later was such large-scale German colonization policy made and Germanness geopolitically pushed forward so far as precisely in this time. Alongside Benedictines and Premonstratensians, in Pomerania, Mecklenburg, Brandenburg, and the present province and Kingdom of Saxony, the Cistercians were the principal promoters of Germanization.

Through Christianity and its emissaries, the German people has thus grown to more than double its original territory. Only small Slavic linguistic islands in the Spreewald and in Lusatia and the Slavic origin of two German princely families (those of Reuss and Mecklenburg) bear witness to the original nationality of these now German lands.

Germany thus became the bearer of the universal empire, which through connection with Rome encompassed the entire Occidental Christendom; thereby German culture was spread throughout the Occident and in the high flowering of the Middle Ages a world-economic large-space policy was made possible. The emperors were bearers of one of the greatest historical-political ideas, the Christian-Roman empire. The influence of the West Franks was only pushed back by the preeminent position of this empire.

Every politics of a nation must go beyond national barriers. Of no nation does this apply so much as of the German. History has taught us this on every page. It is therefore a very limited, erroneous

standpoint when one regrets that the Germans ever crossed the Alps, that they interfered in Roman world affairs and thus withdrew their best and noblest national forces from the fatherland and homeland. If history teaches anything at all, it has shown nothing so clearly as this, that the essence and world-historical significance of Germandom from the beginning lay precisely in that striving for the spiritual and political world capital. Through all centuries there was no more German politics than to strive beyond the Alps (ultra montes); there was no more German politics than the Roman, the romantic. Through all centuries the Germans went to Rome when they were great, when they were conscious of their calling, when they were genuinely German, that is, national.

But not only to German advantage is Germanic politics Christian and Roman politics, but to the advantage of the entire world.

If one wants to judge the struggle of the Hohenstaufen against Rome not only as a political but also as a religious cultural problem, then it was not only a defense of Rome against the German encirclement of the Papal States, but also a struggle for the universal idea of the Catholic concept of the Church, against ruler despotism and servility. Even if in our days it is rightly wished that German historiography, which in past decades often lagged behind the demands of the day due to lack of political passion and fighting spirit, should give up something of its previous objectivity in order to gain in healthy, justified national pride and thus to judge the becoming of things not in airless spaces but under ethnic viewpoints, this effort must not go so far that finally history is only written as it should have been. To misunderstand historical necessities means to pursue illusionistic historiography, means to fear the truth and to stretch historical developments on a Procrustean bed in order to be able to deny that the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation

was nevertheless the greatest idea of the German person and the most powerful creation of the Occident at all, with whose universality nothing else in Europe can be compared. With this, no one-sided glorification of the Middle Ages is advocated, which despite the unity of its worldview oriented from religion exhibited considerable shadow sides that no criticism however inclined to Romanticism can erase. No epoch of human history can be presented as the Christian or as the Catholic age.

Only a few fleeting thoughts could be expressed here that want to contribute to further discussion of the difficult problem. Whoever wants to concern himself more deeply with it will find the first guidance in the literature given as notes. Also in this important question of the correct assessment of such a great section of history, it shows that catchwords can only barricade the calm, dispassionate judgment of the past but do not bring us closer to the solution. History written only for party politics is not scholarship but unpalatable tendency, as the case of Czech-Jochberg has sufficiently proven. Roman campaigns and Crusades, in which the world-historical significance of Germandom is most clearly expressed, can only be criticized from the limited small-national standpoint.

c) National Church, Romanism, and Catholicism

The "Reich Institute for the History of the New Germany," newly founded in October 1935, has among the four major work plans communicated by the chairman Prof. Walter Frank also taken up the investigation of national church movements in the 19th century. A few weeks earlier, the "National Socialist Monthly" (October, p. 67) treated in detail the striving for a German national church in the Middle Ages. Equally noteworthy, because moving on the same line and direction, are substantive statements in the journal "German Nationhood" (1933), 24th issue, "The Catholic Church and the People of the Germans." Here too return conceptions, wishes,

and efforts that have not quite come to rest in the German people since the beginning of the 19th century. It is the urge toward greater or at all complete ecclesiastical independence of Germanness from Rome. A rich propagandistic literature furthermore takes care today of the dissemination of this world of ideas among the common people. Since the people of our times mostly live completely without history and unburdened by knowledge of the past, under the influence of these thoughts they not unwillingly erase every continuity in order simply to leap over centuries of historical development. These are serious questions whose scope one should not overlook even in Catholic circles. With skillful propaganda that exploits various tactical errors of ecclesiastical offices, a mentality toward Rome could gradually be formed in German youth that after decades would have to break through in the most dangerous way. The struggle over Rome has again become the great center around which the thoughts of many respected National Socialist personalities move in our times. Individual radical representatives go so far in their assertions that they designate Catholicism precisely as the death of one's own national character and as the denial of one's own national past and future. Already the Lutheran "Centuriators," who since 1559 published the first "scientific" church history, saw in Rome a "mysterium iniquitatis." Known are the words of Chamberlain, who is rightly designated as a forerunner of this anti-Roman attitude, that the Roman Church has been from the outset "shield and armor-bearer of all anti-Germanic efforts." National church movements are therefore an uprising of Rome-free religiosity that corresponds to the German soul. A proverb says: At Rome the peoples die (Felix Dahn, Gregorovius).

Thus the relationship of Catholic Christianity and national, German thinking has actually been elevated to one of the most important questions of the present. Whoever sees in history only a

racial-biological result of the various peoples will no longer be able to bring up any understanding for the following fundamental considerations. For him, Christianity too, whether in this or that confessional form, but primarily the Roman Catholic faith, has become a matter of history. One could point out to these representatives the work of Germans abroad in foreign Catholic cultural spheres, the great successes of so many significant German Catholic personalities who despite years of separation from the German homeland have lost nothing of their national disposition and whose lives could be called precisely an apology for the synthesis of Catholicism and national character. However, this line of proof hardly touches the essence of the problem and remains superficial; for even individual Catholic German circles have in recent years expressed thoughts about Rome and Germanness, Curia and Catholicism, in which a dangerous eruptive force is hidden. The main accusations raised against Rome from the Catholic nationalist camp are the following:

"Roman and Catholic is, with regard to the present form of appearance of the Catholic Church in the German cultural sphere, an internal contradiction.

The Romanity of the Catholic Church today expresses itself in an extensive cultural connection of the 'Catholic' rite, life, and forms with Romance national character, Romance culture, Roman law, Romance-Oriental feeling for morality and religion. The self-evident dependence of the individual national churches on a center of ecclesiastical unity, fundamentally established in the idea of a Catholic church, is today so overtaxed by the centralization of the ecclesiastical bureaucracy of Rome that one can hardly speak anymore of a German national church with a certain independence and autonomy in individual ecclesiastical matters, such as liturgy and discipline.

In a truly Catholic Christianity, no particular cultural sphere, neither the Romance nor the Germanic or any other, can claim or possess an exclusive predominance.

The Catholicism of the present, however, is only the Catholic form of the Romance cultural sphere.

This centralizing drive of Rome has as a consequence an overemphasis on form and the formal, a position of priority for Roman spirit, furthermore a complete Italianization of the entire Roman Curia with a pushing back of all other nations in the administration of the world Church.

Through the Church itself, through its present system, the German person receives no justice. All reforms and creative thoughts had to be forced from outside through catastrophes or wrested through self-help and thus carried into the Church.

The Council of Trent, which answered the German Reformers and remains determinative to this day for many Catholic forms of piety, disciplinary regulations, and cultic provisions, was in reality a council of the Romance peoples. Since only very few German bishops were at the Council, the reform decrees received a predominantly Romance coloring. Through their execution, the Catholic Church in Germany too became in many respects a church of the Romance cultural sphere.

Since 1870, the legal unity in Catholicism has indeed been clearly expressed, but the internal unity of the Church was lost.

Through this overemphasis on formal law and external ecclesiastical authority, Catholicism appears in the world of conceptions of the faithful (wide circles of the clergy included) much more as a juridical structure, a disciplinarily held-together power system, a hierarchically well-articulated, purely authoritatively directed administrative body, than as a community of divine grace and giving and receiving love. In the exaggeration of the legal and

administrative, the Catholic Church of today clearly shows its Roman face.

Since everything is brought to a uniform smooth formula, especially the auxiliary sciences of dogmatics, exegesis (scriptural interpretation), church history, and moral theology (ethical teaching) suffer.

For Roman Catholic Christians, the field of free intellectual debate and research is constricted to the extreme (Index reform).

The three forms in which the Church today takes shape externally: canon law, treatment of doctrinal teachings, and liturgy, originate extensively from the Romance cultural sphere and must be felt by Germanic people as foreign to the Nordic sensibility.

The Roman Catholic Church under state-political pressure has gone far to meet the numerically completely insignificant Oriental and Slavic peoples—the Copts, Syrians, Armenians, Melchites, the Russians, Greeks, Croatians, etc.—in their national church efforts and has renounced its Roman cultural and legal standpoint with them—why does the same not occur also toward the German nation with its 40 million Catholics?

The Germanic religious and moral feeling was purposefully suppressed by Rome in all centuries for the purpose of a uniformization of the world Church in the Romance sense."

It is difficult to compress these lamentationes nationis Germanicae, as they are so often called, which reach deeply and constantly recur in the past century, into a few brief formulas. An extensive treatise would be necessary to examine the accusations in detail. Only two thoughts may be selected here that could be guiding for the entire assessment of the problem of Rome and the German Catholic.

a) Roman culture and Church are only accidentally, but not essentially connected; therefore Catholicism also cannot be

designated as the Romance-Latin form of Christianity. Of an essential linkage of the two, one could perhaps speak with regard to the philosophical basic truths of ancient philosophy in its scholastic stamp, but even there there is much that need not necessarily be realized everywhere where Christianity advances from religion to cultural synthesis. The Germanic spirit too has influenced the further development of Christianity, and German theology has not remained foreign to the universal Church but has also helped determine the construction of dogma, morality, and precisely canon law. Even before Boniface, when the Irish-Scottish Church, which emerged from the Celtic Breton one, dominated the European continent up to Lombard Upper Italy through the peculiarity of its organization and liturgical language, the principle of authority of the Cathedra Petri was therefore never called into question on national grounds or Rome fundamentally rejected. It must certainly not be denied that in recent centuries many representatives of Christian overseas mission did not possess the prudence and missionary tactics of a Boniface toward ethnic patrimony. The spread of Christianity in the other continents was too narrowly connected with that of cultural, political, and economic export goods of Europe, instead of preaching Christianity among the missionized overseas peoples in close connection with their national character.

Since Christianity can connect itself with every cultural sphere that does not already have an error in its root, it must not be coordinated with any one. None, whether Romance or Germanic, can claim or possess exclusive predominance in a world Church without sinning against the meaning of a religious community of peoples. Thus Christianity is involved with all peoples and in all cultural spheres, enlivening, penetrating, purifying, and refining. A fitting apology for the fruitfulness of Christianity in all cultural possibilities is folk custom, which, despite dogmatic commonality

among Catholic nations, is substantially different among Germans, Romance peoples, and Slavs. Thus individual and popular piety is by no means the same among all peoples. This rather is what is great in a world Church, that every nation can again build a sanctuary within the central temple. One could still adduce the magnificent theological works of the German Middle Ages, these witnesses of the unity of Catholic and national thinking. Despite all polemic against Rome, the Catholic faith itself is never then designated as an intrusion into foreign thinking.

When people in our times play with the idea of a German national church, it often occurs in the opinion that confessions and churches arose only through the quarrelsomeness and lust for power of theologians and priests, whereas in reality, despite deficiencies and human shadow sides, they are historically developed, intellectually long-prepared phenomena and must also be judged as such. Again and again, people for whom religion is a matter of life will gather around a confession, around a denomination as their banner and orient themselves by it.

But even if the confessions were regarded as something historically developed, the attempt toward unity will nevertheless not lead through new divisions, as a national church brings with it, but rather through a closer attachment of faithful Catholics to Rome, in order thus to bring the German cultural element better to bear against the Romance peoples.

b) The national church movements of the Middle Ages came by no means from alleged oppositions of Germanic and Romance types of piety or national cultural spheres, but were almost always of a political nature. (Compare the struggle of Thomas More under Henry VIII.)

It was the court theologians who accompany every age, every political movement and form of government as their apologists and

born opponents of Rome. These national church efforts are not least strengthened by the objection that "the Germanic part of the Occidental family of peoples has been repeatedly maltreated by the Roman Curia and pushed back in favor of the Romance, especially the Italian part, which moreover today in the climate of the Fascist regime succumbs to the 'magic' of a hypernationalism." Again and again it is pointed out that in the leadership of the Church the Romance cultural sphere occupies a dominant position. Even if we could not reject the legitimacy of individual complaints, one thing must not be overlooked, that the Church cannot be transformed into an international League of Nations without being exposed to great upheavals. In the age of national jealousy, a passionate struggle would begin over the supreme leadership of the Curia and endanger every calm objective conduct of business. Who would therefore want to press down the world Church to the role of a League of Nations, which in the few years of its existence, as a result of its cumbersome international apparatus, encounters difficulties everywhere without being able to solve even a single serious political problem. (Cf. the vain calls for help from the minority peoples in Europe.) The predominance of the Romance population segment in the Curia finds its explanation through the seat of the ecclesiastical center in Italy and through the current confessional statistics, according to which the Romance element among the millions of Catholics of the globe forms the majority compared to the German-Germanic and Slavic elements (Italy, France, Spain, South America, Canada). North America is a mixture of peoples and races from which no distinct national character has yet developed. Its many millions of Catholics are to be reckoned to the Romance cultural sphere according to liturgical language and religious form of expression.

No loyal son of the Church will want not to see shadow sides; however, he will never forget that the Church, whichever

cultural sphere may currently have predominance in it, the Germanic, Romance, or Slavic, harbors within itself two elements: a divine one, which preserves it from decline and rigidification in formalisms through the assistance of the Holy Spirit in the apostolic ministry of the Vicar of Christ and the bishops united with him, furthermore through strong religious leading personalities who are given to it from time to time, or through persecutions, from which it has always emerged, even if often numerically weakened, yet internally deepened; and a human, often all too human element, which comes with history and passes away and therefore also participates in all the weaknesses and miseries that are now once connected with everything human. If Germanness has been pushed back strongly in terms of influence in the universal Church, it is not least the consequent phenomenon of the German Reformation, for until the 16th century the German element often had an outstanding influence in many pontificates, which was later simply taken over by the Romance peoples. It must be emphasized again and again that Luther's Reformation, which had to take place within the Church, struck the German people the deepest wound internally and externally politically and carried a seed of dissolution into Christianity itself. Only sacrificial cooperation in the world tasks of the Church can slowly compensate for this damage again, but not the effort to separate still further parts of the German people from the old Mother Church, to which Germany owes Christianization, on the basis of uncertain national cultural sphere constructions and racial dogmas. The German has not had a millennium of Christian culture to sink back today into the ethnic narrowness of a national church Christianity. Just as we apply the order of values of Christianity to racial teaching and not vice versa, we must likewise say, Christianity owes its enduring values not to Germanic or

Romance influences, but rather Christianity first brought true civilization to both.

Whoever therefore truly means it honestly with the German people, let him hold to the cultural-political program of National Socialism, which is built on the fact of confessions, and let him see to it that this attempt to found a "Rome-free" German Church or any other named national church belongs as soon as possible to the past. Such a new foundation would only lead to a struggle to the death for the old churches, including the Evangelical ones, would create a third in addition to the two confessions, and tear apart the German national community forever without any lasting and genuine gain.

IV. CONCLUDING REMARKS.

FASCISM; BOLSHEVISM;
NATIONAL SOCIALISM; CHRISTIANITY

The supreme law of every intellectual-historical examination of spiritual currents is the investigation of interconnections, for there is no rupture between the 19th and 20th centuries either, but only realignments. The struggle of liberalism extends through the centuries in constantly changing forms, but it is always the same struggle, which by its nature will never cease, because there exists a political and cultural liberalism whose forms repeatedly supersede one another in history. The former has been organizationally overcome by National Socialism, but the latter, which extends from the second half of the 19th century into our present, could only be eliminated from German intellectual life through a deepened Christianity. When the degenerate son of political and cultural liberalism, Marxism, went bankrupt in the Reich, a noticeable wave of religious reflection swept through the masses, whom it had previously made spiritually poor with its godlessness. This upswing must not dissipate on the sandbanks of a new doctrine of salvation that is conceived as a substitute for Christianity. Therefore every attempt to construct a distinct philosophy or worldview of National

Socialism ends, as the latest work of the Königsberg Professor Hans Heyse also proves, in a pure this-worldliness, whereby it is entirely overlooked or intentionally concealed that the purest this-worldliness is represented by Bolshevism. This de-divinization of the world with appeal to alleged Greek and Nordic spirituality or to the falsely understood or falsely interpreted National Socialist party program increases the general conceptual confusion, blurs clear fronts, and endangers the inner peace of our German people.

National Socialism is no accident, not the invention of individual men, by no means a radical reversal, but has long been prepared in the German character and its development. It belongs within the riverbed of German history and is rooted in its past.

Rosenberg rightly says that National Socialism brings no absolutely new thoughts. Here too the biblical word applies (Ecclesiastes 1:10): "There is nothing new under the sun and no one can say: behold, this is new, for it existed long ago in the times that preceded us." One could find parallels in the German intellectual history of the 19th century for many things of our day. What is new, however, in every case in the national awakening of the Third Reich is the skillful concentration and systematic intertwining of preceding philosophical, religious, and historical ideas with the national political idea of unity, which however need not necessarily be connected in itself with worldview elements. But since the idea of race and national character forms the center of the entire National Socialist system, one could be tempted to say with Will Vesper that National Socialism is the simplest idea in the world.

Yet the matter is not so simple after all, for the current National Socialist leading writers and the preceding intellectual figures, to whom the former owe many of their ideas, often talk past one another and also past the party program. They speak with the same words, to which however different concepts are attributed,

although they outwardly seem to contain the same thing. We must therefore first eliminate the unclarity of concepts that has occurred through German philosophy of recent decades and restore to the words and concepts blood, faith, worldview, race, people, nation their true meaning, in order to arrive at a fundamental position toward National Socialism at all.

Not only in distant abstract epochs, but also in the spirit standing irresponsibly close to us, one must therefore seek the causes. All essential elements of National Socialism appear earlier, and almost all ideas that had to appear revolutionary around 1923 were already present in seminal form in the nineties. At that time the crisis of German religious consciousness in the educated world also set in, and the collaboration of today took its departure. National Socialism did not bring about this religious crisis that shakes the German person today. As a latent phenomenon it was present much earlier, especially in Protestantism (estrangement of the masses and the educated world from the Church). It is the dissolution process of liberal Protestantism, in which the religion of Christ, in complete contradiction to the religiosity of Luther, had sunk to history and theology to science.

Since the non-Aryan David Friedrich Strauss with his Life of Jesus (1835) and The Old and New Faith (1872) shook the foundations of Christian faith in Protestantism, this crisis has never ceased, for Strauss exerted the deepest influence for decades, including on Nietzsche's attitude toward Christianity.

For almost every religious-cultural assertion in the leading National Socialist literature one could demonstrate a parallel in a liberal theology professor (Harnack, Delitzsch, Drews, Gressmann, Gunkel). Philosophically and literarily, therefore, this turn was prepared.

The Nordic-Germanic element and the race question also had their defenders. Thus one day this crisis had to erupt. National Socialism with its eruptive force had only the task of explosive powder.

The recognition of the interconnections in which this new world arose leads to the open and free examination of the guilt that the departing generation bears for this collapse. Questions of this our fault would be: Did not Europe through the peace treaties of Versailles and St. Germain, which are the names for a metaphysical crime against the German people and thereby against the entire Occident, essentially cause the radicalism of the oppressed German nation? Did not every treaty that recognized these forms already carry within itself from the outset the seed of new discord? On the other hand, did the great national idea have to be loaded with so much worldview ballast in order to approach the German at all? The great lesson of the time, through which the eternal shines, would have to be the purification and turning away from the superfluous, the becoming clairvoyant for the blessings of Christianity also in the Germanic cultural sphere, and the courage for the essential.

With every revolutionary movement there have always been associated in history missteps and excesses of irresponsible elements. No statesman and political leader can prevent that in a time of becoming, endeavors push themselves into the public eye that have long existed, are partly already outdated, but until then have remained in the dark and now suddenly believe that the time of their harvest has come. All the greater was this danger with National Socialism, into which millions of Marxists have passed over without anyone having heard of a work of conversion of these human masses in the sense of a positive Christianity. All the more responsible and sacred, however, is the task of all truly Christian and German-thinking men and women to confront this danger everywhere with

the confession of the essential, to contain the intrusion of a cultural liberalism, and in renunciatory work despite all disappointments to clear the way for a Christian-National Socialist constructive work, so that accompanying phenomena and excesses cannot be elevated to essential components of the National Socialist program.

National Socialism further raises the claim of totality, that is, the demand for complete permeation of all national life, and therefore claims to be a worldview. Some adherents saw in this claim the seed of an inevitable opposition to historically given Christianity and a clouding of the friendship with the Catholic Church established by the Concordat. A long-lasting dispute between the national uprising, which is of decisive significance beyond the German Reich for the entire Occident, and historically given religion would however be an enormous danger not for the German Reich, but in view of the Bolshevist threat for the entire occidental culture. According to the Bolshevist program proclaimed in January 1934, this dispute belongs to the preconditions of the communist advance in Europe. Whoever seeks to eliminate it therefore works against the communist overthrow. In clear anticipation of these developmental possibilities, Adolf Hitler has therefore also warned against the intertwining of national politics with the religious crisis and declared those who commit this error to be the worst enemies of the German people (p. 631), branded the destroyers of the historically given, as long as nothing better is found, as madmen and criminals (p. 294), condemned the old Away-from-Rome movement with the justification that religious teachings and institutions of his people must be inviolable to the political leader (p. 127), compared the attack against the doctrinal system of a religion with the attack against the legal foundations of the state, because the one leads to political anarchy, the other to worthless religious nihilism (p. 631). Since on the other hand every age strives to develop a unified

spiritual form from an intellectual-historical total situation, there arises before the present generation the question: whether it is possible to connect the knowledge and will of the present with the great spiritual and religious tradition of the Occident. Since we believe in the value and absolute necessity of this connection of Christianity and Germanness and fight for it, we place ourselves unconditionally on the ground of the declarations of the leader of the German Revolution. Should the synthesis fail due to human inadequacy, then severe spiritual upheavals would await us: then according to human foresight the Bolshevist revolution as the most radical would first assume historical leadership, until from counterforces, which however would then no longer need to emerge from the occidental cultural sphere, a new equilibrium position would have formed. We as Christians believe that this new equilibrium position would also be determined by Christianity, it is however conceivable that this Christianity would then no longer have its center of gravity in Europe. But these are distant perspectives. Our immediate task in any case consists in fighting for Germanness and Christianity in the Occident.

It would therefore contribute substantially to the calming of minds if the concepts of totality and worldview were clarified. Totality as a program means the complete dominion of an idea over all areas of life. This is initially a very general formula that receives its concrete content only from the life interests of the nation itself. The totality of the state could, for example, lead to an interpretation that would become dangerous to the life interests of the German people, namely if other nations also raised the same demand and in the name of totality the physical and spiritual existence of a German ethnic group were destroyed by a non-German state. Against this interpretation of state totality the German ethnic groups in the Central European space are today rightly defending themselves, and

precisely National Socialist theoreticians of ethnic law have therefore declared the ethnic community as the supporting substance of history. On the other hand, the idea of totality in another sense was thoroughly justified, namely in the sense of the concentration of all national forces on what in the struggle of the German nation for self-assertion is respectively most important, thus for example on international legal and military-political equality, on the recovery of the Saar region, on job creation, on the reorganization of the Reich and similar things.

The word worldview, as already explained in Chapter III, Section 1, is used in a freer and in a stricter sense. In the freer sense it also means a political attitude, the direction of the entire personality toward concrete goals; in the stricter sense one understands by it the totality of thoughts about the destiny of man. If one today speaks of National Socialist worldview and at the same time holds to the previously cited words of the leader of the German uprising, then by National Socialist worldview can only be understood a political-sociological system in which the emphasis lies on practical ethical propositions. If the word worldview is actually used only in this freer usage, nothing is to be objected to this designation. The word becomes misleading only if by it is meant a doctrinal system that should answer the totality of questions about the origin and interconnection of the parts of the cosmic whole and the position of man.

In my book, not sensation-seeking assembly speakers who live in all parties only from radicalisms have been given voice, but leading literarily active personalities of National Socialism who defend their worldview like a theology with earnestness, iron consistency, and irresistible purposefulness. These men spoke to us in their own language. Viewed from a high vantage point from the intellectual-historical perspective, this worldview that is today

intertwined with National Socialism by individual representatives is the necessary consequence of the religious decomposition process in Europe that begins in the middle of the 19th century and has affected Protestantism more than the Catholic Church. Thus the 19th century can be designated as that of materialism, which has penetrated into all areas of culture (historical conception, medicine, philosophy, legal concepts, social question). The 20th century reaped the fruits in the degenerations of Marxism. Would it therefore not be deeply regrettable if also in National Socialism, which wants finally after centuries to give the German people a unified national state idea, religious, philosophical, and historical wrong paths of cultural liberalism were to decompose this national idea, so that at the end of the whole development, if it were not redirected into other channels in time, there would stand not a positive Christianity but the anti-Christian state, in which the religion of Christ would be no life-shaping culture-creating force, but an archaism of past times?

In Catholic and Protestant circles one has not always separated the political from the worldview element in National Socialism. One believed moreover that in the endeavors it was only a matter of a struggle against the deeply regrettable confessional division of our German people, which should be bridged through a stronger emphasis on the three concepts of race, nation, and national community, while it actually concerns fundamental questions of Christianity as soon as politics would also draw in the worldview. Therefore one finds in various works of the classical leadership literature of National Socialism the worldview paths of the 19th century in a pregnant formulation again. If this reform program, which contradicts in every way Article 24 of the National Socialist program, were to be sunk into the hearts of German youth for even just ten years in that shimmering garment and in that captivating form of expression of modern nationalism, which today increasingly

grips all peoples of the earth, then Christianity would have only the sinking generation in Europe, but no youth among its confessors. Thereby the question of associations and organizations would also be solved by itself. Therefore the axe must be laid to the root in order to separate the great national idea from worldview endeavors with which it has nothing to do. In other words, the essential in National Socialism must be recognized and its effect on a Christian Germany appreciated.

Two things must be carefully separated from one another. National Socialism in itself is a political movement that, as long as the means do not contradict natural law and the moral law, in order to unite the Germans in the European space, does not belong before the forum of the Church. Whether these Germans, distributed over many states and cut off from the majority, often violated in their natural rights of mother tongue and culture, one day find themselves together in order to create a great Reich that determines the destinies of Europe, as the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation once was through centuries, would initially under the previously named precautions have nothing to do with religious matters.

A completely different picture emerges, however, as soon as one hears the following words of a leading personality in this context:

"Everything is overshadowed by the worldview confrontation at whose beginning we are just standing. A great movement can only triumph in the long run if it possesses a firm worldview foundation, if from this worldview arise specific value-settings that give all areas their characteristic stamp. That this worldview is therefore combated in a particularly malicious way by those who believed they only had to step down politically is self-evident in view of the greatness of the historical turn. Here especially it is necessary with inner firmness and in unshakeable tenacity to elaborate the foundations of National Socialist outlook through common training

of all divisions of the movement, to consolidate inner unity and unanimity, but to train youth uncompromisingly for the great tasks of the German future."

If National Socialism is thus taken in the sense of a worldview system, as various works in its leading literature strive for in opposition to the program, then those adherents who, notwithstanding their national attitude, want to be and remain faithful convinced Christians, are entitled to have a voice, not only from dogmatic considerations, but because it concerns things that, if not braked in time, would absolutely weaken the national idea in its conquering thrust and in its moral expansive strength in Germans abroad for the long term. Fascism also suffers on philosophical and state-political territory from many worldview unclarities, but this accompanying phenomenon does not emerge strongly everywhere because the Romance peoples in contrast to the Germans often lack systematics and iron consistency in thinking and acting, to the advantage of their own nation.

Seen thus, everything grows into a struggle for the deepest essence of National Socialism itself. Does the national idea, which in itself is a necessary and holy thing, actually only have a future if it is intertwined with a pantheistic worldview in the sense of Goethe, or will it succeed to lead it back to that great line that Hitler himself as the sole authorized interpreter of the movement in his work Mein Kampf has traced for the relationship of religion and politics?

To many, National Socialism appears as the beginning of a European turn in which the previous Romance cultural leadership of the continent is to be replaced by a Germanic one, as the breakthrough phenomenon of old endeavors that goes via Luther, Frederick the Great, Goethe, Kant, and German Romanticism with strongly anti-Roman affects, as a movement in which politics and economics are of secondary rank compared to the awakening of the

Germanic man who sees his religion in forming a worldview from his own essence, free from centuries-old tutelage of a Roman culture. But must a national-political awakening of Germanness actually signify a necessary antithesis to Catholicism? Thus the vague professorial religion of Germanic neo-paganism, just like every religious and racial-historical worldview new construction, is the Achilles heel of National Socialism.

The phrase "Reformation air is blowing in Germany" is therefore not in place. It does not strike the essential, because the ultimate goals of the spiritual confrontations of cultural liberalism reach much deeper. Equally false is the opinion that in this struggle ultimately only Catholicism would be damaged. After a multi-year effect of the new worldview, the world of thought of Luther and thereby also the Reformation Church would dissolve into nothing in the German people.

National Socialism is, as the program already proves, by no means to be equated with the Bolshevism of the East, even if it has various state-organizational things in common with it: the claim of totality, which here as there wants to commandeer the human being, the impossibility of a difference between state and party will, the monopoly on public propaganda, and the belief in the central significance of the political-social order and power, which is elevated to the center of all existence. But while Russian Bolshevism is essentially anti-religious and underestimates the concept of the family, National Socialism according to Article 24 of its program wants to remain on religious ground, even if the concept of religion is not taken entirely in the sense of tradition, but rather all spiritual and religious contents appear more according to political viewpoints. Undoubtedly certain danger elements are connected with this, since ultimately in every political, cultural, and religious movement of history a left and a right wing struggle for sole dominion. It is an

eternal law of history from which no movement has yet been able to escape. While the right wing still thinks in national-Christian conservative ideas, others strive for a kind of deification of man, not as an individual personality but in the national community, a throne-elevation of the political-social, of the nation and race to the absolute, to divine power, to the sole bearer and expression of a national myth. Thus lurks behind National Socialism, as soon as it empties the concept of positive Christianity of its dogmatic-worldview content and returns again to cultural liberalism, the same danger, because in both movements the reduction of all human activity to the power struggle is the element connecting them.

National Socialism is also by no means a Germanic fascism, but rather distinguished from it by the elevation of the concepts of race and national character to highest values, however much the fascist ideal could influence the national movement of Germany in many things of heroic and state-political life conception. Fascism despite Mussolini's conceptual formulation is no religious substitute, no worldview in the sense of a religious politics, but a fighting position against Rousseau and the equality and popular sovereignty proclaimed in 1789. Some researchers assert: Italianness and Catholicity together form the actual totality of fascism. The German however has not yet found in all German tribes the tension balance between his religious soul and Catholicism, in which elements of the Roman cultural world are also present. World-historically closer to National Socialism as a spiritual current stands in any case the Action Française, with which it has in common various doctrines rejected by the Church.

Toward National Socialism, therefore, nothing helps: a fundamental rejection or a purely negative attitude, thinking in the political categories of a vanished time, or an accommodation with the positive Christianity established in the party program. Only in the

tenacious work to free this unique revolutionary movement in the German people from things that need not be causally connected with the concept of nation and the social idea lies the destiny of the German future in Europe. The earlier this separation of politics from the worldview would be undertaken, the more quickly would peace return to the German people and with it the danger of a new intrusion of Bolshevist currents would be banished, which wait for internal political difficulties of an economic kind in order to enter upon the inheritance of a sinking National Socialism that was called to greatness in German history with a reign of terror.

No one in the Catholic camp denies the positive, great, and enduring that lies in this movement, which touches new problems and has raised questions with which Christianity must come to terms in order to find a modern synthesis of Germanness and faith.

The German Catholics are animated by the best will to affirm the new Germany if its construction takes place in the turning away not only from political but also from cultural liberalism; for still in history worldview liberalism has always also become the seedbed of later political upheavals. Communism and Marxism did not grow great in those parts of Germany that were still firmly connected worldview-wise with Christianity, but everywhere where the entire church life of Catholics and Protestants had been dried out by liberalism decades earlier. The Reich German Catholics let themselves be surpassed by no one in their loyalty to people and Reich and affirm the National Socialist Revolution because it was a judgment over the age of individualistic separation and dissolution, a recollection of the eternal order of creation, of the blood and destiny community of the Germans, and of ethnic essential character. They see in this movement the tight concentration and unification of state-supporting forces, a strong leadership responsibility in which the

liberal-democratic fiction of self-government of the people is displaced.

The way, however, to not damage the national unity idea regardless of the wrong paths of left-radical elements is only that which fascism has also taken, which first took up dangerous doctrines within itself but later through a skillful tactic dismantled the intrusion of the worldview ideas of the philosopher Gentile, because they had to be not useful but extremely harmful for the long term to the ultimate goal of the party, the national community and unity of all citizens.

The Italian Society for Philosophy, which stands under the direction of Orestano, has begun the campaign against the idealism of Gentile in order to furnish proof that the worldview of Gentile is not the only one that corresponds to fascism, as Gentile himself wanted to prove ten years ago. The new Italian philosophy will move personality into the foreground and be animated by religious spirit. If we transfer these observations to German National Socialism, we arrive at the following thoughts:

The more in the National Socialist movement the mythical yields to clarity, the sooner can it become the great national Christian unity party of the Germans over all hindrances and differences, which lets everyone find the happiness and peace of heart in his religious worldview. Only thereby would duration and future be secured and every conflict of conscience eliminated, especially the question made superfluous whether a convinced Christian with calm conscience can also be and remain a convinced adherent of this party without coming into contradiction with the teachings of his religion.

The National Socialist movement, which in its beginnings wanted to be only a gathering point of most various directions of conservative, progressive, and national character, so to speak a

peripheral movement, loses through worldview radicalisms, especially also in Germans abroad, much of its original inner attractive force.

The national and racial idea would in itself, as the preceding sections have clarified, be compatible with Christianity, as long as these basic dogmas are not pushed over into the religious—a danger that is all the more threatening because in the national movement since its birth hour on Austrian soil strong anti-church, later anti-Christian affects resounded. To eliminate these or at least to contain them is a question of destiny for every German-feeling person.

If the National Socialist movement does not follow from purely state-political considerations the paths of fascism in order to overcome this worldview inner crisis, then those will be proven right who designate the essence of National Socialism as anti-Christianity and hope for nothing good from it for all of Europe. But it would be an enormous damage if a movement with such powerful effects in its beginnings should ultimately want to dissipate its conquest drive in superfluous worldview struggles and confrontations instead of spiritually strengthening the cultural and fateful connectedness of all Germans against a world of enemies of German greatness and future. The national unity idea must not be fogged by worldview new constructions that destroy old Christian cultural heritage and rob religious peace. Only thus can the danger be avoided that the whole movement ultimately ends in a pure materialism without soul culture. One has often spoken of a Roman limes, whose existence also makes many religious-cultural phenomena of German history more understandable. Perhaps one can also speak of an Elbe line, which should have a no lesser significance for the religious development of the German people. Such great movements as National Socialism are not only the conclusion of a demolition work spanning the preceding decades on the ideas of the past, but also a serious examination of conscience for the bearers of Christianity in

Europe, whether they were not co-responsible through national exaggerations in other states that precisely the German nation had to come to a radicalized conception of the ethnic idea. But National Socialism is also a question to all Christian-minded people in the German language area, whether they were actually always concerned in the past to work toward that balance between Christian and national life conception that the Church of Boniface and Charlemagne understood in such masterly fashion.

Where is the Christian idea in international law still to be found in Europe today, where in the financial economy of states? Is there still an essential difference between the state-political moral conceptions and diplomatic work methods of European peoples with a Christianization reaching back centuries and those of purely pagan nations? How is it that the national idea overruns all earlier conceptions in all peoples and can inspire youth in an almost fanatically to be called form? Has the Christian religion lost its conquering force in the life of peoples? Has thinking and acting from Christian heritage become the privilege of a few circles of spiritually particularly finely sensitive people, while the secularization of public and private life has increased alarmingly since the middle of the 19th century and soon encompasses all realms?

Thus remains, because Christianity is and must remain the living source of strength also in the 20th century, a modern synthesis of Christian, social, and national ideas still always the great goal, whose realization would truly be worth the sweat of the noblest of the German people. The Vienna cultural philosopher Richard von Kralik, who himself for a longer time during his Berlin studies as a young man under the influence of Treitschke moved in thought processes that one today partly designates as National Socialist, was one of the first who in the nationally especially agitated time of the nineties recognized and appreciated this binding and harmonization

of ancient, Christian, and Germanic culture. For him, who was far ahead of his time in much, the ancient Germanic period remained the forecourt of German civilization and education, to which he never renounced despite his Christian conviction. Such paths have nothing to do with bridge-builders who, without previously considering the decisive works of classical leadership literature and above all the spiritual trail-blazers of this movement and without separating the political from the later worldview intrusion, wanted to discover approaches of National Socialism to Christianity everywhere. The goal of nationally and Christian religiously conscious people must be a completely different one, namely a National Socialist movement that confines itself to the purely political and leaves the worldview-pastoral work to the authorized representatives of both confessions—in other words: an essentially Christian National Socialism, in which the race dogma is lifted out of the cultural realm and remains confined to the area of hygiene and social public welfare, without wanting to be as worldview a by no means sufficient substitute for religion and Christianity for the more deeply feeling person. Just as the secularization and politicization of religion, every religionization of a political program must also be avoided.

The only possibility in a confessionally mixed state system is only this path that leaves religion outside the political program with that limitation into extra-ecclesiastical areas that is determined by religious conscience. Therefore Catholics and Protestants must also fundamentally reject that exaggeration of the concepts of nation and national community that aims at a complete destruction of all confessionality, because the latter allegedly makes the national unification of the German people impossible or at least more difficult. The old German Reich army has never in its glorious history, least of all in the World War, suffered in its national patriotic

reliability, although the soldiers belonged to both confessions. The Protestant Professor Fabricius, who has rendered service to the National Socialist movement and whose work was especially mentioned in the preface, rightly says that here one must connect to the tradition of the German army. What did not disturb comradeship there cannot do so in the National Socialist organizations or elsewhere in the people. "For nothing serves so much for the calming of the national comrade as when he knows that he may tend his inherited sanctities unhindered, continue to think his pious thoughts, and continue to live in his faith community. Conversely nothing embitters him more than when he sees his most sacred endangered or when he must merely fear it could come into danger."

Nothing is therefore so important, also in the interest of the non-Reich German ethnic community in Europe, as to follow these paths. If this separation does not succeed, then begins the ancient power test between Church and state at which the medieval Reich idea was shattered, but the Church also received severe wounds, in order to make place for the modern human type who increasingly detaches wider areas of cultural life from religion and relegates religion into the last chamber of conscience, until one day he will have arrived at Bolshevism, this ultimate consequential phenomenon of our time.

In times of great spiritual confrontations and conceptual confusion the old German saying applies: In clarity lies truth. In the feverish glow of a political turning time Schelling is right when he writes: "The most dangerous thing for man is the dominion of dark concepts."

In an age that stormily tears open the depths of the German soul and churns up all distresses, no compromise saves, no diplomatic worldliness and tactics, but only witness-bearing and manly

conviction toward Christ and the nation. I do not believe that National Socialism only with the values of people, blood, and race will banish that danger from the East that, comparable to the Mongol hordes of the 15th century, wants to break over Europe, for Bolshevism is not only a political movement and economic theory, but the threatening symbol of the collapse of a millennia-old world in Europe that no longer seems to have the strength to connect Christianity and modern political forms in a new synthesis.

In this sense one could apply to the leaders of National Socialist Germany the words with which the oldest document of German jurisprudence and one of the most remarkable monuments of Germanic spirit altogether, the Lex Salica from the years 508 to 511, closes its prologue: "May Christ live, who loves the Franks, may He protect their realm into all eternity! And grant their leaders the light of His grace and their armies His protection!"

Only through the clarification of concepts does one best serve Christianity, the Church, the national idea, and thereby the entire German ethnic community. The German people still has a great task to fulfill in Europe, to become the firm unshakeable bulwark against the false doctrines of the East that threaten occidental culture like the specters of Walpurgis Night. How much must therefore every faithful son of his people and the Church wish this clarification, which can only serve as a blessing to the Reich, the movement, and the inner peace of the German nation.

The final result of my intellectual-historical investigation, which has of itself become a cultural-political confession-writing, can therefore be no other for a nationally conscious German who still wants to hold fast to the foundations of Christianity and preserve his people from a pantheistic religious substitute than the following:

If National Socialism is only a political-social problem, then there is no reason for Catholics, who let themselves be surpassed by

no one in love and loyalty to state and nation, not also to be faithful unreserved adherents of this movement. Precisely German Catholicism and faithful Protestantism standing in the Confessing Church would supply the National Socialist party with the most valuable and most self-sacrificing forces, who will also remain with the flag in hours of dangers and internal political tensions, not like those circles who yesterday were still Communists and international fatherland-less fellows, have never accomplished anything for Germanness and today to the damage of the whole cause want to boast of a hundred-percent National Socialism.

If however National Socialism is identical with a new worldview elevated to dogma, in which a superabundance of wrong paths of past decades are built together into a dazzling myth especially fascinating youth, then silence and waiting would be an assent and denial of faith. The Church can renounce associations and organizations, even the economic support of the state, painful as it would also be if in an over-organized state system these means were torn from religion, but it can never renounce its eternal leadership gift to be and remain the lighthouse of truth in calm, even more in stormily agitated times, as the present is. Then applies an apostolic word: "One must obey God more than men," and that which Rome has so often spoken through the centuries against numerous errors:

We cannot!

V. NOTES.

I. INTRODUCTORY MATTERS.

1. "Scènes et doctrines du Nationalisme", Paris 1902.

2. "Enquête sur la Monarchie", 1901.

3. "Positive Christianity in the New State", Püschel Publishing, Dresden 1936.

4. As is well known, this Point 24 reads: "We demand freedom for all religious confessions in the State, insofar as they do not endanger its existence or offend against the moral and ethical sense of the Germanic race. The Party as such represents the standpoint of a positive Christianity, without binding itself confessionally to any particular confession."

5. According to the "National Socialist Monthly Journal", 1935, p. 296, both would be equivalent (cf. the essay "Alfred Rosenberg Answers"), "the struggle officially borne and supported by the Church against the National Socialist foundations of the Myth and thus against the National Socialist worldview in general." Already in the December issue 1930 of the "National Socialist Monthly Journal", p. 430, "The Myth of the Twentieth Century" was designated as the work to which one must in the main unconditionally give assent.

6. Also important is the other work by Alfred Rosenberg, "The Essential Structure of National Socialism", Central Publishing of the Party, Franz Eher Successors, Munich 1934, with sections on: Worldview, Religion and Politics.

On the Catholic side, the "Studies on the Myth of the Twentieth Century", fourth reprint, Autumn 1935, are fundamental. Strictly scientific and calm objectivity distinguish this book, which was also designated in the official organ of the Party, the "National Socialist Monthly Journal", as the best counter-publication. Ziegler in the "National Socialist Monthly Journal", 1935, p. 294: "The Studies are without doubt by far the most comprehensively conceived and most skillful of all the counter-publications against the Myth and have, since they are written with the pretension of strict science, not failed to have their effect in certain circles." After the Catholic Church in Germany officially took a position in its "Studies on the Myth of the Twentieth Century" on the essential questions and above all had exposed the biblical-theological and church-historical teachings of Rosenberg, the director of the Apologetic Center, Walter Künneth, answered the attacks and questions of the "Myth" from the Protestant standpoint, Wichern Publishing, Berlin 1935. Through the introductory sentences of Bishop Marahrens, this publication has also acquired a somewhat official character, which is further strengthened by the almost undivided approval of the entire Protestant Confessing Church of Germany. Also valuable is "The Myth and the Gospel. The Protestant Church in Defense and Attack against the Myth of the Twentieth Century", Publishing and Distribution Company "Contemporary History", Berlin 1934, Luther Publishing, Witten 1938.

In contrast to these works, scientifically insignificant but characteristic of the mentality of our time is the work by Oskar Reichenauer, "Faith, People and Homeland", Thoughts on the "Myth

of the Twentieth Century", Publishing and Distribution Company "Contemporary History", Berlin 1934. The author, formerly chief editor of one of the largest daily newspapers of the Alpine lands in Graz, writes: "This book has given me inner peace, the peace of my soul, has let me attain all the highest that can be granted to man. For that I am grateful, for I have found God and my German nationality in its resurrection and bear him within myself and speak the language of the heart with God, which is his language." Not uninteresting for knowledge of the intellectual leader of the National Socialist movement is also the work "Alfred Rosenberg. The Man and His Work" by S. Th. Hart, in the Party Publishing House, 1934.

7. Thus National Socialism is evaluated by the adherents of the Nordic movement, which however was repeatedly rejected by Hitler himself as not corresponding to the Party program. Cf. the journal "Clan Signs", 1934, No. 32, Hans Hauptmann, "Separation of Spirits": It must therefore be clearly recognized:

- Between the National Socialist and the Christian worldview there exists an insurmountable opposition.

- As long as ecclesiastical dominion over the spirituality of large segments of the people continues, the indispensable spiritual and emotional foundation of the political national community cannot occur.

- This spiritual foundation of the political national community can first become full reality when all members of the nation are definitively withdrawn from the magical-suggestive influences of the Christian churches; when they, because one cannot live religiously without community, have come to an understanding with one another on the basis of true tolerance in the acceptance of a unified faith that corresponds to their Nordic racial disposition and places no obstacles in the way of their free development.

- The removal of the Christian countercurrents, by which the development toward national unity is disturbed, cannot be enforced through state power.

- In the people itself, therefore, the forces must be released to which falls the task of freeing the spirit and soul of all Germans from the inhibitions in which they are entangled through the Christian worldview."

Very similar is the journal "Der Blitz" of January 19, 1936: "German and Christian are two mutually exclusive concepts and the designation 'German Christians' is a contradiction in itself, since a person can be either only German or only Christian..." The same Either-Or is formulated at another place thus: "Either one is a National Socialist and therefore takes the rule and guideline for one's action from the conscience bound to Aryan morality, or one adheres to the Bible book born out of Jewish spirit and Jewish view, which widely cultivates a morality that has nothing, absolutely nothing to do with Aryan spirit and which promises world domination to Jewry in dozens of places. Then one simply cannot be a National Socialist. There is no third option!"

8. Catholics and Protestants undertook such attempts in the first year of National Socialism, such as Kurt Eckhard, "Victory Curve or Turning Point of the Ages, Reflections on National Socialism", pp. 45 to 54, J. F. Lehmann Publishing, Munich 1931; Lortz, "National Socialism and Church", Supplement to his Church History, p. 391: "National Socialism was long considered anti-Catholic. This opinion was however only a disastrous misunderstanding: 1. through ignorance of the positive program of National Socialism, as it had already been laid down authentically and generally accessible since 1925 in Hitler's book, My Struggle; 2. through a confusion of National Socialist combat propaganda and certain reformers of Germanic-pagan or culture-struggle type who

attached themselves to the National Socialist movement with the core of the movement; 3. through a certain confusion of political Catholicism as a religious and spiritual idea. This misunderstanding was definitively eliminated through the pastoral letter of the German bishops of Pentecost 1933 and through the Concordat 1933 between the Holy See and the National Socialist government of Germany.

A comparison of the results of our analysis of the nineteenth century and the present with the fundamental ideas and fundamental tendencies of National Socialism shows to what unusual degree and sense National Socialism is fulfillment of the age and organically grows out of it as the crowning of the deepest strivings of the age, and that in it the indicated fundamental ideas break into reality with elemental force and transform life in its entire breadth—this stamps upon it the unmistakable seal of vocation. It also shows further that we now have the right to speak of a true turning point, which will be lasting beyond all that is episodic: the opening of a new period of time in the grand sense. If we recognize the hour of our duty, this age (despite the perhaps still coming setbacks, possibly also confessional struggles) will essentially serve religion and the Church and be unexpectedly well equipped for the struggle against godlessness."

As fundamental affinities between Catholicism and National Socialism, Lortz designates the following:

a) Both are essentially mortal enemies of Bolshevism, Liberalism and Relativism—these mortal diseases of the age leading to dissolution and principal enemies of the work of the Church. The concepts fundamental to National Socialism of true, thus (in service to the people) bound freedom and authority correspond exactly to the demands that Gregory XVI and Pius IX taught in the nineteenth century under the mocking laughter of the entire so-called progressive world; in addition the opposition to Freemasonry.

b) Common struggle against the godlessness movement, public immorality, against the leveling that destroys authentic life, for a meaningful and fruitful, God-given structuring of human society and for the corporative construction of society demanded by Leo XIII and Pius XI (Encyclical Quadragesimo Anno); advocacy for the right of the manual laborer and peasant to a dignified existence; against the unnaturalness and traditionlessness of modern large cities and factory cities.

c) Through its Christian fundamental demand: Common good before private good; through the broadest emphasis on the prerogative of the community before the individual; through the understanding of the indispensability of the political form, from which the individual can first live his deepest life; through the construction of the entire life on the leader principle and authority (instead of on the mechanistic principle of number or majority)—National Socialism both initiates an important completion of the particularistic Germanic human type, and on the other hand simultaneously brings its inner disposition closer to the Catholic (living from objective teaching and sacramental institution).

d) Perhaps most important: National Socialism is confession. In contrast to the all-dissolving doubt and unbelief, it again brings to the widest circles the experience that the believing attitude is not something doubtful or even inferior, as Liberalism had taught the entire society to claim, but rather that which first completely fulfills man. Even if the divine Church will never identify itself with any movement whatsoever, it cannot do otherwise than gratefully welcome this mighty ally in the struggle against godless rationalism."

Into these endeavors also belongs the series of writings "Reich and Church", Aschendorff, Münster in Westphalia; Michael Schmaus, "Encounter between Catholic Christianity and National

Socialist Worldview"; Joseph Lortz, "Catholic Access to National Socialism, Seen from Church History". The series of writings was intended to open access to it for those faithful Catholics who until the revolution stood doubtfully toward National Socialism for reasons of conscience. For this purpose both work out how much common intellectual property National Socialism and Catholicism possess. Lortz proceeds more from the historical and objective, Schmaus more from the fundamental. Catholicism and National Socialism have in common according to both authors especially the emphasis on community, authority and reverence for what has become.

Similar words were spoken at a press reception by State Secretary Hauser, who was simultaneously Reich leader of the Working Group of Catholic Germans (Völkischer Beobachter, March 9, 1934, exact text):

"The Catholic worldview is essentially related to National Socialism in fundamental questions. The Catholic person must only free himself from views, inhibitions and conceptions that the era of parties and parliamentarianism forced upon him. The Catholic person must recognize the poison that was irresponsibly inoculated into him for years by political profiteers. All who conducted political business with Catholicism would, seen in the long term, have placed this Catholicism, which they often only feigned but did not live, on a foundation that contradicted the religious feeling of the broad layers of the people in their hearts. They were on the best path to render the Catholic religion and its fellow believers a bad service in the end. We, who helped to prevent this development, are today accused of a religiously hostile attitude. That is an injustice which, if one does not soon recognize it, can take terrible revenge."

Noteworthy is also the work by Walter Grundmann, "God and the Nation", Fock Publishing, 1933. "A Protestant Word on the

Will of National Socialism and its Interpretation by Alfred Rosenberg." Actually therefore two words. One about National Socialism and one to National Socialism. The word about National Socialism gives a condensed but excellent overview of the National Socialist view of history. It wants to show and make understandable the situation and will of National Socialism and is directed primarily to ecclesiastical and reserved Christian circles. The word to National Socialism wants to admonish it to also throw off the slag of Liberalism in religious matters and to reach back to that great community-forming and responsibility-educating power: God.

The author endeavors to effect a marriage between National Socialist thinking and Christian teaching, also Christian world teaching. In this connection a serious-objective, commendable engagement with Alfred Rosenberg's more comprehensive evaluation of race. Grundmann believes in a dependence of psychic forces on racial conditions, but explains the Christian world religion mainly from the spirit.

The evaluation of these solution attempts from the Christian standpoint occurs in the later sections of the book.

II. THE BECOMING OF THE MOVEMENT.

1. Threatened were the border areas of Styria, Carinthia, further the ancient German language islands in Carniola.

2. Cf. the writings of Masaryk, Palacký. The entire tragedy of the "problem of Austria" and the tragedy of the Austrian soul reveals itself in Hitler's youth history.

3. W. Block, "The Ecclesiastical and State Conditions of Austria in the Last 120 Years" (1870); Klein Hattingen O., "History of German Liberalism" (2 volumes, 1910).

4. Cf. the numerous scientific works of the Graz university professor Loserth and Franz Günther, "The German Peasants' War". Oldenbourg Publishing, Munich (both strongly one-sided); Hugo Hantsch, "History of the General German Peasants' War", 1925. On the "Counter-Reformation"; Leopold Schuster, "Life History of Prince-Bishop Martin Brenner".

5. Twelve Speeches, 1880, Five Speeches, 1891, Molisch, "History of the German-National Movement in Austria", 1820; G. Hertwig, "Georg R. von Schönerer" (4 volumes, 1913 to 1923).

6. A devastating judgment on this movement is found in the book "My Struggle" by Adolf Hitler: "If it (the Away-from-Rome Movement) was successful, then the disastrous church schism in Germany would also be overcome and the inner strength of the Reich could only gain most enormously through such a victory. However, neither the premise nor the conclusion of this struggle was correct (p. 120). It did succeed in wresting some 100,000 members from the Church, but without it thereby suffering even any particular damage. It really needed to shed no tears for the lost 'little sheep' in this case; for it lost only what had long since no longer fully belonged to it inwardly (p. 128). But one does not study history in order then, when it should come to practical application, not to remember its lessons or to believe that now things are simply different, thus its eternal truths are no longer to be applied; rather one learns from it precisely the practical application for the present. Whoever is not capable of this should not imagine himself to be a political leader; he is in truth a shallow, though usually very conceited fool, and all good will does not excuse his practical incapacity (p. 129). Nothing is more dangerous for a political party than when it allows itself to be guided in its decisions by those jack-of-all-trades who want everything without ever really achieving even the slightest thing." (p.

128.) Compare Coudenhove-Kalergi, "On the Characterization of the Away-from-Rome Movement", Gerold Publishing, Vienna 1900.

7. Cf. on the following the journal "Bonifatius Correspondence", pp. 181 to 182, Prague 1935.

8. Cf. the fate of the historians Pastor and Johannes Baptist von Weiß.

9. Heinrich Donat, "The German Catholics in the Czechoslovak Republic", Ambros Opitz Publishing, Warnsdorf 1934.

10. Kigling, "History of the German Catholic Conventions"; A. Sickert, "Montesquieu's and Rousseau's Influence on the Pre-March Liberalism of Baden", 1914. "German Liberalism in the Age of Bismarck." A collection of unpublished letters of leading politicians. (Edited by Heyderhoff and Wentzke, 1925 to 1926, 2 volumes.)

11. E. Pfersche, "The Parties of the Germans in Austria Before and After the World War", 1915.

12. Stillich, "The Political Parties in Germany", Vol. 2: "Liberalism", 1911; A. Wahl, "Contributions to German Party History in the 19th Century", 1910.

13. Groß, "The Prophets", "National Socialist Monthly Journal", 1, 1930, pp. 29 to 35, and Walter Bobe, "Richard Wagner's Doctrine of Regeneration", "National Socialist Monthly Journal", 12, 1931, pp. 112 to 120.

14. Werner Deubel.

15. Erwin Guido Kolbenheyer, "Paracelsus"; Sauer.

16. Cf. the research of Barker, Josef Koch, Breslau (March issue of "Liturgical Life"), Steinbüchel, Alois Dempf, Bonn; Erich Seeberg. (Two lectures at the Lessing-Hochschule in Berlin, Mohr Siebeck Publishing, Tübingen 1934.)

17. Karl Kindt therefore flatly denies Eckhart the German spirit (in Will Vesper's journal "Die neue Literatur", 1935). His

teaching is a poorly disguised new edition of the philosophy of syncretic Judaism.

18. Hermann Mandel, "Kiel, German Faith in God from German Mysticism to the Present", Armanen Publishing, Leipzig 1934.

19. Karl Heuß, "The Germanization of Christianity as Historical Problem", "Journal for Theology and Church", Issue 2, 15th year, Mohr Publishing, Tübingen, and Rudolf Otto, "West-Eastern Mysticism", 1929², pp. 108 ff.

20. "Magistri Eckardi opera latina. Auspiciis instituti S. Sabinae." Fasc. 1: Super oratione dominica, ed. Klibansky (Leipzig 1934); Fasc. II: Opus tri-partitum, prologi, ed. Bascour (Leipzig 1935).

21. Rudolf Odebrecht, "Nicholas of Cusa and the German Spirit", Junker & Dünnhaupt Publishing, Berlin 1934.

22. Paul de Lagarde, "Writings for the German People". Vol. 1: "German Writings." Vol. 2: "Selected Writings." 2nd edition, J. F. Lehmann Publishing, Munich. This second edition also brings the speech that Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf gave at Lagarde's coffin.

23. Ernst Horneffer, "Nietzsche as Herald of the Present", 2nd edition, A. Bagel Publishing, Düsseldorf, 1935; Josef Hofmiller, "Friedrich Nietzsche" (Coleman's "Small Biographies", 18), Charles Coleman Publishing, Lübeck; Ernst von Aster, "The Philosophy of the Present", A. W. Sijthoff's Publishing Company N. V., Leyden 1934, treats these spiritual movements on German soil partially with apt judgments (Southwestern School [Wilhelm Dilthey] and the Nietzsche Successors [Bäumler, Spengler]).

24. Nietzsche himself had as a sharply testing ethnopsychologist the following disconcerting judgments regarding his own people:

"We Germans are Hegelians, even if there had never been a Hegel, insofar as we (in contrast to all Latins) instinctively attribute a deeper meaning and richer value to becoming, to development, than to what is..."

"As a people of the most monstrous mixture and stirring together of races, perhaps even with a preponderance of the pre-Aryan element, as a 'people of the middle', the Germans are more incomprehensible, more comprehensive, more contradictory, more unknown, more incalculable, more surprising, even more terrifying than other peoples."

25. Walther Spethmann: "The Concept of Mastery in Nietzsche." New German Research, Philosophy Department, Junker & Dünnhaupt Publishing, Berlin 1935.

26. Letter 1875: "I am deeply ashamed when I encounter the suspicion that I have anything to do with this Catholic essence fundamentally hateful to me... our good, purely Protestant air! I have never until now more strongly felt my most intimate dependence on the spirit of Luther than now." (Kröner Collection, Leipzig 1932.)

27. Cf. Theodor Litt, Leipzig, "Philosophy and Spirit of the Age", p. 15, Felix Meiner Publishing, Leipzig 1935. On the position of Dilthey and his circle toward the present cf. O. Westphal, "The World and State Conception of German Liberalism", Munich 1919.

28. "Life Paths of My Thinking", pp. 348 ff., F. Bruckmann Publishing, Munich 1922², and "Lifelong Companions". He calls Voltaire as well as Frederick the Great a "torch of truth".

29. Georg Schott, "Chamberlain, the Seer of the Third Reich", Selection from his Works, F. Bruckmann Publishing, Munich. A content-rich essay about him by Albert Erhard in the journal "Die Kultur", pp. 409 to 430, Vienna 1900/01.

30. Cf. further Chamberlain's works "Immanuel Kant" and "Goethe", "Cosima Wagner and Houston Stewart Chamberlain in

Correspondence 1888 to 1908. Edited by Paul Pretzsch, Philipp Reclam, Leipzig 1934. Compare Chamberlain's word about the Germans (April 11, 1896): "It is indeed a mysterious people, this German, without any instinct, without any power of discernment." But he loves this people for the sake of another. "There is something wonderful among us Germans about the difference between the Anglo-Saxon and the German, and though the German may be called to bring forth the mightiest spirits, I nevertheless believe ever more that the mighty people is only to be found, to be hoped for, among us." 1892.

31. Cf. the letter that Chamberlain addressed to Adolf Hitler on October 7, 1923.

32. Curt von Westernhagen, "Richard Wagner's Struggle Against Spiritual Foreign Domination", J. F. Lehmann Publishing, Munich 1933.

33. Thus writes Kif, "German Youth and Oswald Spengler", in the leadership organ of the Hitler Youth, 1934, p. 20: "Youth does not believe in him, it honors and respects him indeed as the only brilliant spirit among those who do not belong to the age borne by the spirit of youth. But it also knows that it is its unshakable faith in the leader and his history-shaping mission that will let National Socialism victoriously overcome its ever and ever again existing tests and trials. It knows that the revolution of youth is stronger than the revolution of the proletariat, and that through the former the latter is impossible, and it also knows that as long as this revolution of youth endures, Germany is strong enough in blood to confine the revolution of the colored world within its boundaries."

34. Ulrich Noack, "Historical Science and Truth", G. Schulte-Bulmke Publishing, Frankfurt a. M. 1935.

35. "Heinrich von Treitschke in German Intellectual Life of the 19th Century". By Ernst Leipprand. W. Kohlhammer Publishing in Stuttgart 1934.

Noteworthy is the judgment of the pure-blooded Nordic Sir Austen Chamberlain, "Down the Years", Cassell Publishing, London 1935 (memoirs): "But the real revelation came to me from Treitschke, whose lectures on Prussian history at the university I regularly attended. My impression of his teaching activity and its effect I recorded in a letter dated October 31, 1887, in which I wrote: 'Treitschke has opened a new side of the German character to me—a narrow-minded, arrogant, intolerant, Prussian chauvinism. The worst of it is that he is forming a school. If you continually preach to the youth of a country that they stand on a higher level of creation than other nations, the young people are only too ready to believe it, and the teacher who descends to this becomes popular and attracts a large audience. But it is very dangerous.'"

36. Cf. his books: "Ultramontanism, Its Nature and Its Combat", "The Modern State and the Roman Church", "Rome and the Center Party", "The Papacy in Its Social and Cultural Significance".

37. The following passages from the book "Fourteen Years a Jesuit", I, pp. 10 to 12, II, p. 17, Leipzig 1909/10, are adopted almost verbatim in Rosenberg's "Myth" as dogmatic foundation: "But religion according to time and country appears especially according to racial differences in thoroughly different forms of manifestation. Let us remember Hellenic belief in the gods—how noble, beautiful and free it is, how oppressive and paralyzing by contrast the Jewish law of fear and the dogma of eternal hell always emphasized by Ignatius of Loyola. How one practices religion is a question of one's race and one's people. What distinguishes the Germanic man is by no means only the independent thinking thirsting for freedom, but

above all the holy earnestness of his life. He does not want to be merely pious, also not merely free, but pious and free at the same time. Precisely therein lies the characteristically German. Let us honestly confess: between Christianity as the chaos of peoples forced it upon us and the innermost soul-faith of the Germanic man there has never been true agreement, never."

"...I learned to understand and appreciate the concept of religion, free from churchliness and also in opposition to it; I learned to know the churches as what they are: developmental diseases of religions... Also the ultramontane papacy and in general ultramontanism as political misuse of the Catholic religion I learned to know. It came to my consciousness that the representatives of Christ contrary to their religious calling had gradually become political great kings."

"My Berlin studies were the beginning, were the dawn of later clear recognition."

38. Cf. Michael von Rabentechner, "Robert Hamerling's Religious Youth Development", in the "Yearbook of the Austrian Leo Society", p. 148, Herder Publishing, Vienna 1932.

39. "Prehistory of the Germanic and Roman Peoples" and appeared as a separate book "Rulers and Heroes of Germanic Prehistory", Philipp Reclam Publishing, Leipzig.

40. Christian Janssen, "German Poetry of the Present", B. G. Teubner Publishing, Leipzig 1935.

41. Currently he is already rejected despite his services to the movement, cf. "Völkischer Beobachter", No. 338 (December 4, 1935): "But there is a greatness that is no longer living for us. It is past, not decayed. Not that it never existed, it still exists unchanged, but it no longer speaks to us. It is from yesterday, but not from today. We do not want to mistake mastery and do not want to offend against it, only because it is no longer for us, but we also do not want

to lose ourselves before ourselves, only for the sake of this mastery." J. Papst.

Cf. R. Muth on the astonishing following that Stefan George received from not ordinary people in his Maximin cult; "Hochland", 1933/34, II; Clementina di San Lazzaro, "Stefan George", Imola, Coop. Tip. Editrice Paolo Galeati, 1935.

42. "Dietrich Eckart, a German Poet and the Champion of the Folkish Movement", by Albert Reich, "Dietrich Eckart". "A Testament," Edited and introduced by Alfred Rosenberg. 2nd edition. Central Publishing of the NSDAP, Franz Eher Successors, Munich 1935.

43. "We say that we are Christians, but we are not; we cannot be either. Christianity and tribal consciousness are as incompatible as..." (Löns to Swaantje in "The Second Face"); further similar thoughts in "The Werewolf". It is a confession of the poet when he writes: "We Germans have never been believers. We always had religion, but a this-world religion; the beyond we reserved for later. With both feet we stood on this earth, lived our life in discipline and custom, did not intoxicate ourselves with lust and cruelty and therefore also did not need, like the Asians, opiates like remorse and penance. To our gods we stood as to our princes; we paid them punctually the tribute, made front, led them past, and with that—done!"

Was Löns a pagan? When someone urged him to write against Christianity, he got the answer:

"I should write against it? No, my dear fellow, I don't think of it at all! Playing prophet in the land? If everyone had the courage to be himself, the specter would be dispersed at once. I write my books, they work more than if I wrote thick volumes of tendency and theory."

Above all, however, his books "Last Hansabur", "The Red Beeke" and the collection volume edited by Deimann "For Clan and Custom" must be noted, which give a picture of this religiously disintegrated person who also stepped among the opponents of Charlemagne and saw in Lower Saxony the mother soil of the best creative forces.

44. Main works in Wilhelm Gottl. Korn Publishing, Breslau: "Socialism and Foreign Policy", "The Political Man", "The Prussian Style", "The Eternal Reich": Volume I: The Political Forces. From the contents: On the Measure of Our Consciousness. On the Universal. On the Dogmatic. Victory and Failure. Germans over Europe. The Ghibelline Fate. Middle of Europe. To North and East. Nationalism. The King of Prussia. The Third Reich and the Young Peoples. On the Tragic. The Gothic March. The German in Protestantism and The Second Reich.

Volume II: German Spirit: Contents: Erring Germans (Günther, Lenz, Grabbe). Leading Germans (Luther, Schiller, Nietzsche). Rapturous Germans (Eckhart, Paracelsus, Böhme and Novalis). Decisive Germans (Winckelmann, Lessing, Kant, Fichte and Moltke).

Volume III: Shaping Germans. Contents: Romanesque Period (Charlemagne, Henry the Lion, Frederick II.) Gothic (Wolfram von Eschenbach, Walther von der Vogelweide, Master Wilhelm of Cologne). Renaissance (Dürer, Holbein, Cranach). Protestantism (Leibniz, Bach, Klopstock). Transition (Mozart, Beethoven, Wagner). German Age. Goethe. New Age.

45. "Our Historical Responsibility", Writing of the unnamed following to Ernst Krieck. But the December issue of the leadership organ of the National Socialist Youth (Issue 23, 1935) already rejects Moeller. He was not a forerunner and preacher of National Socialism, but the representative of a reactionary (!) politics (p. 6).

46. Wilhelm Hartmann, "Paul de Lagarde, a Prophet of German Christianity. His Theological Position, Religious View and Piety". Theological Works on Biblical, Church and Intellectual History. Edited by Ernst Barnikol. Issue 1, 1934.

47. Some of his thoughts recur in the leading folkish-national journal for 17 years "Germany's Renewal", Editor W. von Müffling.

48. The Catholic literature in this field, which is almost impossible to survey, culminates in the great masterworks on social questions by Pesch, Biederlack and Johannes Messner; Friedrich Bülow, "The German Corporate State". National Socialist Community Politics and Economic Organization, Alfred Kröner Publishing, Leipzig 1935.

49. Jarmer, "German Law and National Socialist Concept of Property", "National Socialist Monthly Journal", 1931, Issue 10, pp. 24 to 27; R. Walther Darré, "Damaschke and Marxism"; the same, "New Nobility from Blood and Soil", pp. 54 to 60.

50. Th. W. Stadler, "The Social Announcements of the Popes 1832 to 1931", Benzinger & Co. A. G. Publishing, Einsiedeln-Cologne.

51. R. Walther Darré, "The Peasantry as Life Source of the Nordic Race"; Eugen Schach, "National Socialism and Cooperative System" ("National Socialist Library").

52. Adolf Hitler, "My Struggle", pp. 245 to 302, 579 to 597.

53. W. Parchmann, "German Land and Forestry in the National Socialist State", pp. 10 to 21.

54. R. Walther Darré, "On the Rebirth of the Peasantry", "Germany's Renewal", 1931, Issue 11, pp. 641 to 649; M. Schönike, "National Capitalism", "The German National Economy", 1932, Issue 1, pp. 17 to 19.

55. Gottfried Feder, "Fundamentals on National Socialist Economic Policy", "National Socialist Yearbook", 1932, pp. 197 to 205.

56. Adolf Hitler, "My Struggle", pp. 670 to 683.

57. Gottfried Feder, "Fundamentals on the Financing Question of the Work Procurement Program", "The German National Economy", 1932, Issue 5, pp. 143 to 149; the same, "The Manifesto for Breaking the Interest Slavery of Money".

58. and 59. Gottfried Feder, "Breaking the Interest Slavery", "National Socialist Monthly Journal", 1931, Issue 10, pp. 27 to 30.

60. Gottfried Feder, "National Socialism and Property", "The German National Economy", 1932, Issue 2, pp. 49 to 88; Jarmer, "German Law and National Socialist Concept of Property", "National Socialist Monthly Journal", 1931, Issue 10, pp. 24 to 27; Alfred Rosenberg, "The Nordic-German Law", "National Socialist Monthly Journal", 1930, Issue 7, pp. 299 to 310. Valuation of Germanic and condemnation of Roman law. "In the falsification of the Nordic honor-conscious legal idea through Roman-Syrian influences lies one of the deepest causes of our present social fragmentation as well." "In the Roman legal conception lies at the same time the sanctification of individualistic capitalism. The economic individual being becomes the highest value..."

61. Othmar Spann, "The True State", pp. 198 to 300; Max Frauendorfer, "The Corporate Idea in National Socialism", pp. 22 to 27 ("National Socialist Library").

62. Florentine Hamm, "Woman in Germany's Decline and Rise", "National Socialist Monthly Journal", 1932, Issue 22, pp. 1 to 19.

63. Adolf Hitler, "My Struggle", pp. 144 to 180.

64. Gottfried Feder, "The Housing Crisis and the Social Construction and Economic Bank as Savior from Housing Misery,

Economic Crisis and Unemployment Misery" ("National Socialist Library").

65. Gregor Strasser, "The National Socialist Work Procurement Program", "The German National Economy", 1932, Issue 8, pp. 138 to 142; Hans Buchner, "The Social-Capitalist Consumer Cooperatives" ("National Socialist Library").

66. Gottfried Feder, "The Program of the NSDAP", p. 20.

67. Gottfried Feder, "The German State on National and Social Foundation", pp. 68-69 ("National Socialist Library"); J. Leßmann, "Through Labor Service Obligation to Property", "Germany's Renewal", 1931, Issue 6, pp. 340 to 347.

68. Friedrich Hildebrandt, "National Socialism and Agricultural Labor", pp. 31 to 34 ("National Socialist Library"); Hans Heinrich, "German Living Space and German Economy", "National Socialist Monthly Journal", 1931, Issue 15, pp. 284 to 289.

69. Gregor Strasser, "The National Socialist Work Procurement Program", "The German National Economy", 1932, Issue 8, pp. 135 to 142; Johann Dorner, "Peasant Estate and National Socialism", pp. 30 to 37 ("National Socialist Library").

70. Gottfried Feder, "The German State on National and Social Foundation", pp. 128 to 142 ("National Socialist Library").

71. Acta Sanctae Sedis, p. 29, 255 ff.

72. Walter Frank, "Court Preacher Adolf Stoecker and the Christian Social Movement", Hanseatic Publishing House, Hamburg.

73. Cf. the apt judgment of Adolf Hitler, "My Struggle", Vol. I.

74. Gerhard Dobbert, "The Fascist Economy", Reimar Hobbing Publishing, Berlin 1935; Ugo Mariani, O. S. A., "I principii corporativi nelle encicliche pontificie". (Extract from "Battaglie fasciste". Booklet no. 3, Perugia.)

75. This concept appears for the first time in Constantin Frantz, "The Greater Germany", Wilhelm Gottlieb Korn Publishing, Breslau 1935. Newly edited by Eugen Stamm. In Frantz, one of the greatest publicists of Germany, thoughts are found already 70 years ago that have today become National Socialist heritage.

III. RELIGIOUS, MORAL & PHILOSOPHY-OF-HISTORY TEACHINGS OF NATIONAL SOCIALISM.

1. Worldview, conception of the world. The "Reichswart," No. 50, 1935, December 14, writes in response to the article by Professor Dornseiff in the "Berliner Tagblatt": "Worldview on the Semantic Change of a Word": "National Socialism brings the word worldview back to honor. It can and must do so, because it has itself emerged from a real worldview, that is, from its way of viewing the world, and in all its effects strives toward the realization of this its worldview."

2. Compare on the Catholic side: "The Church in the Turn of the Ages." Edited by Kleineidam and Russ. "Spirit or Blood?" by Desiderius Breitenstein, O.F.M. "Myth or Religion?", "Worldview" by Paul Simon, Bonifatius Press, Paderborn; from earlier times compare also the book still valuable in many respects "Catholic Worldview and Modern Thought," Collected Essays on the Main Stations of Modern Philosophy, by Franz X. Kiefl, Publishing House formerly J. G. Manz, Regensburg 1922.

3. Moeller van den Bruck, "Worldview, the Third Reich" (special edition).

4. Alfred Götze, in "Euphorion," Journal for Literary History, Vol. 25, 1924.

5. "National Socialist Worldview," Junker & Dünnhaupt Publishers, Berlin 1933, Free Contributions to the Philosophy of National Socialism from the years 1919 to 1933.

6. "The Philosophical Foundations of National Socialism," Ferdinand Hirt Publishers, Breslau 1938.

7. "Fighting Scholarship," Hanseatic Publishing House, Hamburg 1934.

8. "The Way Upward." A Book about Religion and Worldview by Wolfgang Grobner, Wilhelm Braumüller Publishers, Vienna-Leipzig 1934. Misleading is Karl Eschweiler, "The Truth of the Speech about Worldview," in the journal "Deutsches Volkstum," March issue 1936, pp. 174 to 185.

9. "Positive Christianity," Püschel Publishers, Dresden 1936.

10. The leadership organ of the Hitler Youth, 1934, p. 28, writes: "National Socialism has coined the concept 'Positive Christianity' and incorporated it into its program. A 'definition' of this concept therefore remains reserved to National Socialism alone."

11. Thus Lagarde, in the spirit of the historical theology of Protestantism, regarded dogma as a "compulsory substitute for faith."

12. Compare what is to be read in the September issue 1935 of the Protestant monthly "Zeitwende," p. 378: "No doubt, we live in a thoroughly dogmatic age. The NSDAP has its firmly outlined program, which must not be shaken. The state of the Third Reich has made it its own and is in the process of implementing it uncompromisingly in all areas of life and culture. Only the Church would some reproach for holding unrelentingly and unwaveringly to its dogmas."

13. "The Program of the NSDAP and its Worldview Fundamental Ideas," 10th edition, p. 49, Eher Publishers, Munich 1930.

14. The phrase about the "morality and moral sentiment of the Germanic race" in Point 24 of the National Socialist program received many rejecting commentaries from Catholic circles before the seizure of power, because they believed these words also referred to the otherwise specially protected "positive Christianity" of the movement. Such a restriction of Christianity would doubtless be incompatible with the supernatural character of the Christian religion, whose morality may not be determined by nationality or race if it is not to cease being revelation and world religion. Moreover, the two concepts morality and moral sentiment contain a tautology.

15. "The Christian Statesman"; "The Church of Christ and the State of Hitler"; "National Civic Education" (all published by Hanseatic Publishing House, Hamburg).

16. "Myth and Ethos," A Debate with Alfred Rosenberg, "Deutsches Volkstum," 17, 1935, p. 501.

17. "German Writings," "On the Relationship of the German State to Theology, Church and Religion."

18. "Judaism, Christianity, Germandom" by Friedrich Nietzsche, Documents on Contemporary History, Paul Stegemann Publishers, Berlin 1934, edited by Paul Bergenhagen.

19. Alfred Müller, "Racial Degeneration under the Cross," Adolf Klein Publishers, Leipzig.

20. Authoritative are the various works of Hans Günther, who describes himself as an Old Darwinist and has laid the intellectual foundations also for the legislation of National Socialist law: "Racial Science of the German People," first published in 1922. "The Nordic Idea among the Germans," 1925. "Small Racial Science of the German People." "Racial Science of Europe." "Racial Science of the Jewish People." "Nordic Race among the Indo-Germans."

Ernst Ritterhaus, "Constitution or Race?," J. F. Lehmann Publishers, Munich 1934; Ernst Rüdin, "Racial Hygiene in the National State," Lehmann Publishers, Munich 1934.

The Information Office for Population Policy and Racial Care, Berlin W 35, Reich Office, in execution of the orders issued by Reich Ministers Frick and Hess for the entire field of population policy, publishes the monthly "Neues Volk," Journal of the Information Office for Population Policy and Racial Care. The "Journal for Racial Science" has rapidly risen to become the most noted anthropological professional organ of the German-speaking area (Ferdinand Enke Publishers, Stuttgart). It owes this to the program of its editor Egon Baron von Eickstedt (Breslau), who attempts to make the holistic method, which considers body and soul equally, the research tool of anthropology.

Compare further Oswald Menghin, "Spirit and Blood," Anton Schroll Publishers, Vienna 1934, especially the sections: Race, Language and Culture, the scientific foundations of the Jewish question. A supplement is provided by the work: "The Equal Value of the European Races and the Paths to their Perfection." Edited by Karel Weigner, Publishers of the Czech Academy of Sciences and Arts, Prague 1934.

21. Rosenberg, "The Essential Structure of National Socialism," pp. 11 to 18; Hitler, "Mein Kampf," pp. 431 to 457, 481.

22. In the older books from Lehmann Publishers, Munich, on race, unfortunately thoughts are not infrequently developed that one can describe with Nietzsche as examples of racial vanity and self-overestimation.

23. It would not be difficult to refute this assertion with an abundance of Catholic scholars in natural science, to whom humanity owes no small progress, although they were equally deeply

disposed toward Christian religion and science (Secchi, Hagen, Pasteur and many others).

24. Equally clear are the statements of Walter Gross, the leader of the racial-political office of the movement; compare his speech "Race in the New Historical Image," delivered at the seminar for Hitler Youth leaders at the College for Politics in Berlin (text in the "Bayerische Volkszeitung" of February 2, 1936).

25. "Deutsche Presse," Journal of the Reich Association of the German Press, No. 1, of January 5, 1935.

26. Compare Karl Saller, "The Path of the German Race," an outline of German racial science, Felix Meiner Publishers, Leipzig 1934. Against him wrote the leader of the Racial-Political Office, Dr. W. Gross, "The Idea Remains Pure," "Völkischer Beobachter," January 23, 1935.

27. Compare his books "The Nordic Soul, an Introduction to Racial Psychology," "Race and Soul," an introduction to the meaning of life's form, J. F. Lehmann Publishers, Munich; "Race and Character," Part I, Diesterweg Publishers, Frankfurt am Main, 1930.

These purposes are also served by the monthly of the Nordic movement, "Rasse" (1934 ff.), Teubner Publishers, Leipzig-Berlin, also "Volk und Rasse." Illustrated monthly for German nationality. Racial science. Racial care. Society for Racial Hygiene. J. F. Lehmann Publishers, Munich. Compare also Bruno Petermann, private lecturer for psychology at the University of Kiel, "The Problem of the Racial Soul," J. A. Barth Publishers, Leipzig 1935.

28. Egon Baron von Eickstedt, "Foundations of Racial Psychology," Ferdinand Enke Publishers, Stuttgart 1936.

29. Heinz Bücher, "Ernst Haeckel, A Pioneer of Biological State Thinking," "Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte," December issue 1935.

30. "Reflections on Violence," Paris 1907.

31. Predecessors in a certain respect were Comte de Boulainvilliers (died 1722), Montlosier (died 1838) and the Italian Francesco Montefredini (died 1892).

32. Fundamental are the relevant thoughts of Alfred Rosenberg, "Revaluation of German History." The speech is reprinted in the January issue 1938 of the training letter of the Reich Training Office of the NSDAP.

R. Eichenauer, "Race as the Law of Life in History and Development," Teubner Publishers, Leipzig-Berlin 1934; K. Zimmermann, "German History as Racial Destiny," Quelle & Meyer Publishers, Leipzig 1934; Ludwig Schemann, "Race in the Humanities"; E. Bauer, "The Decline of Cultural Peoples in the Light of Biology"; both published by Lehmann Publishers, Munich. Partially belonging to the realm of fantasy and coordination literature are the books by Richard Eichenauer, "Music and Race," Paul Schulze-Naumburg, "Art and Race," also Lehmann Publishers, Munich.

Already in 1933 a Czech Jochberg had accomplished a "National Socialist" revision of all of German history in one volume —terrible to read. Very soon the Party had to take action against the misuse of the word "National Socialism." Fate also overtook a similar fruitful "historian," Heinrich Bauer, in the leadership journal of the National Socialist youth "Wille und Macht" (Issue 2 of January 15).

33. In this sense Rüdiger writes, "The Tasks of the New Fighter," in the National Socialist youth journal "Wille und Macht" (Issue 18, 1935): "We now see the meaning of world history not in whether the development of peoples has entered a compulsory path through the influence of Christianity, but rather to what extent blood-based forces have prevailed in struggle with and against national cultures and have led to the victory of a racially appropriate culture. From this perspective, world history appears to us as a

continuous struggle, as expression of a dynamic battle of the most diverse racial souls for dominion over this earth. That this our view is correct is proven to us precisely by the particularly sharp confrontation currently going through the whole world with a worldview that is suited to destroy the best primal forces of Nordic blood altogether and thus to extinguish the life-light of the soul-force of the dominant race on this earth...

German National Socialism is founded on blood and soil, honor and work, and consciously turns against every form of life that does not find its roots in races and peoples... Now begins the struggle for a unified lifestyle of the nation."

34. Particularly embarrassing for distinguished German scholarship are the aberrant statements of Wilhelm Stapel in his book "A Theology of National Socialism."

35. Compare the works of the Society for Germanic Prehistory and Early History (journal "Nordische Welt").

36. Noteworthy are the words of Alfred Rosenberg in his lecture "The Struggle for Worldview," Berlin, Kroll Opera, February 24, 1934:

"This racial science is in its depth nothing more than a far-reaching attempt at German self-reflection. When in these past years it was declared that racial science was anti-Christian, we can today note with satisfaction that the swastika banner has been saluted by both Catholic and Protestant churches, that thereby external recognition has been accomplished and the churches are prepared to grant their due to the new science. But when after this concession it is again declared that racial research must not turn against Christianity, we must say that it has not done so in itself, but for the rest, natural research cannot make its action dependent on whether the results contradict one or another view, but rather whether its premises prove to be false or correct. There is no presuppositionless

science, but there has always been only science with presuppositions, and therefore the question is whether these presuppositions, born from the spirit of ingenious men, prove themselves in the course of research or not."

The same thoughts are found in the leader of the Munich University Institute for Racial Hygiene, Lothar Gottlieb Tirala, "Race, Spirit and Soul," J. F. Lehmann Publishers, Munich 1934 (especially last section: Race and Worldview).

Very similarly spoke Hauer at the large Berlin conference of the German Faith Movement (October 1, 1934): "Race and faith belong most closely together and are absolutely not to be separated. The opposite view is combated by the German Faith Movement as destructive in both the religious and biological sense. For thereby the reality of blood as a creative power, which is simultaneously our destiny, is undervalued or even set aside as worthless and hindering to religious life."

37. Reventlow, "Where is God!," a religio-philosophical work, Reichswart Publishers, 1934; the writings of Bergmann; the worst form is represented by the anti-Semitic writer Arthur Dinter in his journal "Religiöse Revolution," who was rightly expelled from the NSDAP because of his anti-Christian attitude. Compare "Kirche und Volk" in the special issue of "Hochkirche," Munich 1934, p. 222 ff. Only Hauer and Reventlow are to be taken seriously, the rest is mostly contemporary conjuncture or belongs to the realm of pathology.

38. "National Socialism can and will never be able to identify itself with the efforts of the German Church. It is the expression of a new spiritual attitude and worldview of the German people, but the German Church is a federation that has set as its goal the religious renewal of the Protestant Church and its conscious nationalization."

K. F. Jurda, "National Socialism and German Church," "Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte," 1931, Issue 17, pp. 374 to 375.

39. Hans Günther, "People and State in their Relationship to Heredity and Selection." A lecture. 2nd edition, Lehmann Publishers, Munich.

40. J. Zollschan, "The Role of the Racial Factor in the Fundamental Questions of Cultural Morphology," Paris, publisher Rousseau, 1934.

41. W. Schmidt, "The Position of Religion toward Race and People," Haas & Grabherr Publishers, Augsburg 1932, and "Race and People," Kösel & Pustet Publishers, 1936; Hermann Muckermann, "Outline of Racial Science," Schöningh Publishers, Paderborn 1933; Albert Mitterer, "Race and Man according to Thomas Aquinas," in "Schönere Zukunft," 1935, No. 48 to 51; Walter Berger, "What is Race?," Gsur Publishers, Vienna 1936. Published by the Philipp-Sitta Memorial Society.

42. Strongly amateurish in character is the following collection, whose appearance could in itself be welcomed: Johannes Schottky, "Personality in the Light of Heredity." In collaboration with F. Bürger-Prinz, O. Graf, E. Hefter, G. Kloos, F. Panse, F. Stumpfl, G. B. Teubner Publishers, Leipzig and Berlin, 1936.

43. The well-known racial researcher Lothar Gottlieb Tirala, Munich ("Is the Decline of Cultural Peoples a Biological Necessity?"), who takes a contradictory position, declares:

"We are far from abstracting from spirit in mental characteristics and replacing them through purely physical ones. Racial hygiene need not present any hypothesis about the connection between body and spirit. It leaves that with a clear conscience to natural philosophy. The charge of racial materialism, which has been made against racial hygienists from many quarters, especially by

pseudo-philosophers and scholastics, is to be rejected with all decisiveness."

On the other hand, the same researcher in "Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte," 1934, pp. 943 to 950, "Race and Worldview":

"The finest and most delicate creation of a race, simultaneously also the crowning and perfection of its spiritual powers, is its worldview. We believe that our worldview too is a vital expression of the Germanic racial soul... Therefore we can conclude that hereditary endowments of spirit are the causes for which the same worldview repeatedly comes to light among these peoples. In this occurrence lies a deeper meaning. Thus our people has found its way back to the true sources of its being, its racial endowments, after it had been led astray for decades or perhaps centuries by people of foreign race to renounce its own racially appropriate worldview. It made the futile attempt at all possible points to take up foreign-racial worldview, pacifistic teachings, not only to absorb them but to live according to them. The turning away from this inappropriate worldview is task and destiny."

44. On the changeability of important racial elements, compare the research results of the leading authorities: Professor Scheidt, Hamburg, and Professor Fischer, Berlin.

45. For literature compare Theodor Fritsch, "Handbook of the Jewish Question," 38th edition, Hammer Publishers, Leipzig 1935; A. Orel, "Judaismus, The World-Historical Opposition to Christianity," Styria, Graz 1933. The sociologist Orel gives in this expanded special printing from a large-scale book "Oeconomia perennis" a noteworthy position on the Jewish problem on the basis of spiritual-religious and racial questions.

Irene Harand, "Sein Kampf. Answer to Hitler," Publishers of "Gerechtigkeit," Vienna 1935. Since National Socialism came to

power in Germany, the author has combated racial theory and anti-Semitism in a weekly published under her name, in connection with Jews, Jewish collaborators and inspirers from the same circle to which Dr. Moriz Zalman also belongs. Therefore enthusiasm for Judaism is displayed by the author. The recognition of Jewish abilities and achievements is emphasized to such an extent that it directly challenges opposition, the book as a whole must be rejected as one-sided and therefore cannot be taken seriously.

Emmerich Czermak-Oskar Karbach, "Order in the Jewish Question," Reinhold Publishers, Vienna 1933.

J. A. Kofler, "The Catholic Church and Judaism," Eher Party Publishers, Munich 1931 (directed against the "Judaized" Jesuit Order).

Count Coudenhove-Kalergi, "Antisemitismus," Paneuropa Publishers, Vienna 1929.

46. Hans Günther, "Racial Science of the Jewish People," Lehmann Publishers, Munich. Some from the contents: Individual racial features. Blonds and light-eyed among the Jews. Racial composition of individual larger Jewish groups. Movements and gestures. The mauscheln. Olfactory peculiarity. Criminal acts. Health situation and disease tendencies. Jewish non-Jewish mixed marriages. Effects of Jewish spirit. The root of "anti-Semitism."

47. Arthur Trebitsch, "German Spirit or Judaism?," Antaios Publishers, Berlin 1921.

48. Especially to be mentioned are besides Richard Wagner and Förster (Nietzsche's brother-in-law), Dühring, the Protestant cathedral and court preacher Adolf Stoecker, Berlin, the literary historian Adolf Bartels, "The Justification of Anti-Semitism," 1921. Moreover we find similar efforts also in France: Léon Bloy (Catholic polemicist and novelist, "Le salut du monde par les juifs"; Édouard Drumont, "La france juive," a book that appeared in the eighties and

exercised strong influence on Léon Daudet and thereby on the Action française, which however curiously combats Judaism because it is accessible to German interests (!) and political goals.

Nietzsche himself often contradicts himself in his position toward the Jews, as his correspondence with Theodor Fritsch proves, which appeared in Hammer Publishers, Leipzig 1936:

"I lack that highest ethical standpoint of which Lagarde speaks. Believe me, this abominable desire to have a say of naive dilettantes about the value of people and races, this submission to 'authorities' which is rejected with cold contempt by every more composed spirit (e.g. E. Dühring, R. Wagner, Ebrard, Wahrmund, P. de Lagarde—who among them is the most unauthorized, most unjust in questions of morality and history), the constant absurd falsifications and corrections of the vague concepts 'Germanic, Semitic, Aryan, Christian, German'—all this could in the long run seriously anger me and bring me out of the ironic benevolence with which I have hitherto watched the virtuous velleitates and pharisaisms."

Also according to Kant, the Old Testament contains no religion, but rather the contracts concluded with the "tribal idol" Yahweh, in order to establish themselves among the host peoples!

49. Sebastian Brunner (died 1893), Josef Scheicher (died 1925), August Rohling (died 1923), whose main work "The Talmud Jew" experienced 18 editions, and Bishop Ottokar Prohaska of Stuhlweissenburg (died 1927) with his address at the German Catholic Congress in Frankfurt am Main, 1921; Fr. Steffen, "Anti-Semitic Movement and German National Movement in the Light of Catholicism," 1925.

50. Compare the most recent work "The Jews in Germany," published by the Institute for the Study of the Jewish Question, Eher Central Publishers, Munich 1935 (with statistics), the speech of

Reich Minister Goebbels, "Racial Question and World Propaganda," at the Nuremberg Party Rally on September 2, 1933 and especially A. Wagner, "Foundation of Political Economy," Berlin 1892/93.

51. Journal "Archiv für Katholisches Kirchenrecht," Year 1888.

52. A first attempt is the work by Wilhelm Grau, "Anti-Semitism in the Late Middle Ages," Duncker Publishers, 1935. As the Munich historian Karl Alexander von Müller critically notes in his foreword, almost all preliminary studies are still missing for a serious history of Judaism in Germany.

Compare also "Court Preacher Adolf Stoecker and the Christian Social Movement," Berlin 1928, 2nd edition, Hamburg 1935; G. Liebe's book "Judaism in German Past," Jena 1924, satisfies neither scholarly demands nor a German framing of the question.

53. Compare the writing of the Tübingen theologian Gerhard Kittel, "The Jewish Question," W. Kohlhammer Publishers, Stuttgart 1933. Kittel develops, in the spirit of current National Socialist laws, the necessity of separation of Germans and Jews from the conditions that have resulted from Jewish emancipation and assimilation. Kittel does not consider Zionism a possible solution. Kittel wants the restoration of the "guest status." The Jews should again become genuine, pious Jews. Cultural autonomy for a real Jewish culture. (Hebrew newspapers. Independent Jewish private school system. No mixed marriages.)

54. Gottfried Feder, "The German State on National and Social Foundation," pp. 56 to 59, "Nationalsozialistische Bibliothek." In the National Socialist state, citizenship will include moral obligations toward state and people. The Jews will be fundamentally excluded from citizenship.

55. Hanseatic Publishing House, Hamburg, January issue 1933.

56. Fabricius Cajus, "The Jewish Question in the Protestant Church," Publishing Company for Newspaper Service, Berlin 1934.

57. G. Gundlach, "Excluded are exceptional laws against Jewish citizens as Jews, namely from the standpoint of the modern state," in M. Buchberger, "Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche," I, p. 505.

58. To this direction belong also writings such as: "World Freemasonry, World Revolution, World Republic." An investigation of the origin and final goals of the World War. By Dr. Fr. Wichtl. 11th edition, 50th to 54th thousand. Published by E. Berg.

59. Rosenberg, "Crimes of Freemasonry," p. 180, writes: "Here in the position toward the spirit of the Old Testament lies the pivotal point of the formation of our future. Whether our spirit, freed from a chain, will raise itself. Whether Christianity has overcome its childhood diseases, or whether the work of our great ones to show us the direction for our feeling and thinking was in vain, that will soon have to be decided."

Characteristic are the statutes of the League of Racial Europeans (Alliance Raciste Européenne), whose members commit themselves to the following: "What we have won in Germany, to preserve against the counter-currents appearing everywhere (Catholic movement, intrusion of the Church into the area of freedom of conscience, disguised Freemasonry, newly awakened Jewish arrogance, class and professional conceit, intellectual revival attempts of overcome party ideals)."

60. Compare on the September law of 1935 "Protection of German Blood and German Honor" the treatise by the court assessor Wöhrmann, Munich, in the "Juristische Wochenschrift," September 1933, "The Problem of the Dissolution of Mixed Marriages between Aryans and Jews."

61. Here reference may be made to some passages from Alfred Rosenberg's "Myth of the Twentieth Century." He says: "Marriages between Germans and Jews are to be forbidden, sexual intercourse between Germans and Jews is to be punished with confiscation of property, expulsion, penitentiary and death, depending on the severity of the case. If a German woman voluntarily engages with Negroes or Jews, she is in no case entitled to legal protection, also not for her illegitimate children, who are not granted the rights of German citizenship from the outset."

62. Compare Rak (Racial-Political Foreign Correspondence," No. 4, April 1936); Abraham Heller, "The Situation of Jews in Russia from the March Revolution 1917 to the Present" ("Schriften der Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaft des Judentums," No. 39, M. & H. Marcus Publishers, Breslau 1935).

63. A wicked representative of this direction was the Jewish Socialist Karl Kautsky, whose book "Ethics" was a typical case of this decadence. ("Morality is nothing other than the wanting-to-have-validity-enjoyment of man according to his subjective discretion.")

64. "Russia and Europe" (1869); translated into German 1920.

65. Compare Nietzsche's judgment: "In the Jewish Old Testament, the book of divine justice, there are men, things and speeches in such a grand style that Greek and Indian writings have nothing to set beside it. One stands with terror and reverence before these monstrous remnants of what man once was, and will have sad thoughts thereby about old Asia and its protruding little peninsula Europe, which absolutely wants to signify against Asia the 'progress of mankind.'"

66. A series of excellent defense writings by Sellin, Volz, Hempel already exists. Here attention should be drawn to a brochure

whose author, Old Testament scholar at the University of Marburg, stands close to National Socialism: H. W. Hertzberg, "The German and the Old Testament. A Contribution to the Questions about Germandom and Bible," Töpelmann Publishers, Giessen 1934.

67. Hans Windisch, "Paul and Judaism," W. Kohlhammer Publishers, Stuttgart 1935.

68. Compare Gustav Mensching, Riga, "Racial Appropriateness of the Christian Idea of Sin," Leopold Klotz Publishers, Gotha 1934. Mensching proceeds in his convincing argumentation from the insight that the idea of sin is "the substance of Christianity."

69. Today's canon law has in procedural law strong borrowings from Roman law. Especially the strongly formalistic procedure is not approved by some, but in its totality it is a mosaic of influences in which precisely the oath of seven witnesses has been adopted from Germanic legal customs. In any case, no one will want to derive an essential change of Christianity from the adoption of many parts of Roman procedural law and Germanic special conceptions into the Code of Canon Law.

70. Thus judges Eugen Fischer, the director of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute and Rector of Berlin University, one of the most significant racial researchers of the present, the Nordic race has, where it has appeared most purely and still does, no above-average cultural achievements to show, but rather in combination with somewhat equal races. He supports this assertion by the fact that in his judgment the majority of great Germans have sprung from a crossing of the Nordic with the Alpine race.

71. On the nature, tasks and goals of the racial policy of new Germany, the special issue with rich bibliographic information provides guidance: "German Racial Policy." With a foreword from the Race and Settlement Office of the SS. by Horst Rechenbach,

"Süddeutsche Monatshefte," Munich. Compare further F. Lenz, "Human Selection and Racial Hygiene (Eugenics)," 3rd edition, Munich 1931; J. Mayer, "Legal Sterilization of the Mentally Ill," Freiburg 1927; F. Pfattbacher, "Eugenic Marriage Impediments?," Vienna 1933; J. Kaup, "National Hygiene or Selective Racial Hygiene?," Leipzig 1922.

72. Text, "Völkischer Beobachter," December 15, 1934, "The Worldview Struggle of National Socialism."

73. Compare his work "The Efficiency of Our Race and the Protection of the Weak," 1895, which is dependent on Gobineau and Lapouge, less on the Englishman Galton.

74. P. Agapito Martin de Sobradillo, O.M.C., "Procreation and Sterilization from the Standpoint of Natural Law," Librairie Saint-François d'Assise Publishers, Paris 1933.

75. Compare also the implementing regulation of December 10, 1935 ("Reichsgesetzblatt," I, p. 1419).

76. Further regulations are also expected for this.

77. In the years 1923 to 1929, according to individual researchers, the number of the feebleminded and insane in the public welfare institutions of Germany increased by 65 percent.

78. The well-known race and heredity researcher Prof. Eugen Fischer, Berlin, spoke at the large assembly in Karlsruhe on February 22, 1934 on "Race and Culture": "We have in Germany the strongest birth decline that any people in Europe has ever had, and have far surpassed France and Poland in this. The statistics show that above all the healthy forces in Germany impose a voluntary birth restriction on themselves. This leads to the most serious danger. Even if hardship might force us to certain restrictions, we must still ensure that at least the good and healthy reproduce and not only the hereditarily inferior. National Socialism was the first to recognize

this necessity. It will thereby save Germany, give an example to the world and thus also preserve all European culture from decline!"

79. "Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte," No. 24, 1934, p. 137.

80. Compare moreover Article 6 of the implementing provisions to the German Reich Law: "Persons who permanently enter a closed institution are exempted from sterilization if the state is not burdened by this residence."

81. Acta Apostolicae Sedis, 1931.

82. In Sent. II dist. 42, qu. 1, art. 4. Compare Edelbert Kurz, "Individual and Community according to St. Thomas Aquinas," 1932, p. 59, and Eberhard Welty, O.P., "Community and Individual according to the Principles of St. Thomas Aquinas," 1933, Anton Pustet Publishers, Salzburg-Leipzig.

83. Numerous evidence is contained in Albert Mitterer, "Man and Woman according to the Biological Worldview of St. Thomas and that of the Present"; Zt. Th. 57, 1933, pp. 491 to 550, Fel. Rauch, Innsbruck 1933, and Albert Mitterer, "Man's Service to Nature according to the Worldview of St. Thomas and that of the Present." A contribution to natural and cultural philosophy; Zt. Th. 56, 1932, pp. 1 to 48, Fel. Rauch, Innsbruck.

84. It is a fallacy to point to the celibacy of its priests ordered by the Catholic Church for justification of sterilization, since the motives belong to another moral evaluation and therefore there can be no question of an intervention in natural law. One thing is the possession of a function, another is its use.

85. According to the "Völkischer Beobachter," No. 231, 1935, Alfred Rosenberg stated in his speech delivered in Heiligenstadt on August 18: "Moreover, St. Thomas Aquinas declared in his main work that it is sometimes permitted to mutilate someone in his limbs. He writes as follows: Because further man has

as his end a relationship to the whole community, of which he is a part, the cutting off of a particular limb can indeed be to the disadvantage of the body of the individual, but serve the best of the community. This passage going far beyond sterilization has apparently escaped the Church. I therefore permit myself to point this out."

The passage cited here is of course treated in numerous scholarly writings on the sterilization question on the Catholic side and is also found in the marriage encyclical of Pius XI. But Rosenberg stops in his reproduction where Thomas continues: "insofar as the amputation of a limb is inflicted on someone as punishment for the suppression of transgressions." That St. Thomas here has only the case of penal mutilation in view emerges from the following sentence, which Rosenberg no longer brings: "And so one, as he is lawfully deprived of life entirely by public authority because of the gravest transgressions, is also lawfully deprived of a limb because of not so enormous transgressions." By no means does St. Thomas go "far beyond sterilization," but rather clearly limits the permissibility of bodily mutilation to the case of unequivocally proven personal and correspondingly grave guilt.

Thomas II. II. question 65, art. 1.

But because the whole man himself is ordered, as to his end, to the whole community of which he is a part, as stated above, question 61, art. 1, and preceding question, art. 2 and 5, it can happen that the cutting off of a member, although it turns to the detriment of the whole body, is nevertheless ordered to the good of the community, insofar as it is inflicted on someone as punishment for restraining sins. And therefore just as by public power someone is lawfully deprived entirely of life on account of certain greater offenses, so also is he deprived of a member on account of certain lesser offenses.

86. F. Naujoks-Boenninghausen, "The Technique of Sterilization and Castration," Ferdinand Enke Publishers, Stuttgart 1934, and Georg Heinrich Schneider, "Outline of X-ray Sterilization," F. Karger Publishers, Berlin 1931; Hermann Muckermann, "Nationality, State and Nation Seen Eugenically," Essen 1935; Eugen Schmitz, "Modern Eugenic Efforts," Tyrolia Publishers, Innsbruck-Vienna 1934; Hermann Muckermann, "Eugenics," Ferd. Dümmler Publishers, Berlin 1934; "Kind und Volk," 10th edition, 1934.

87. Ignaz Seipel, "Nation and State," Wilhelm Braumüller Publishers, Vienna 1917; Karl Braunias, "National Idea and State Formation in the 19th and 20th Centuries," J. C. Mohr Publishers, Tübingen 1934; Walter Pembaur, "Nationalism and Ethics," Wilhelm Braumüller Publishers, Vienna 1935; Bruno F. Jahn, "Meaning and Morality of Nationalism, Attempt at a Rational Foundation," Cotta Publishers, Stuttgart 1934 (aberrant); Paul Kluckhohn, "The Idea of the People in the Writings of the German Movement," Junker & Dünnhaupt Publishers, Berlin 1933.

88. Hans Kern, "Ernst M. Arndt, the Eternal German," Eugen Diederichs Publishers, Jena 1930; Paul Requadt, "Volk und Staat" (Selection from Arndt's Works), Kröner Publishers, Leipzig 1934.

89. Ernst Bergmann, "Fichte and National Socialism."

90. Fichte, "The Way of the Nation," Georg Müller Publishers, Munich 1932, and Xavier Léon, one of the most outstanding Fichte researchers of the recent past. Compare his works: "Fichte et son temps," Armand Colin Publishers, Paris 1922 to 1924, and "La philosophie de Fichte dans ses rapports avec la conscience contemporaine," Alcan Publishers, Paris.

91. Rudolf Steinmetz, "German National Socialism." An Appreciation from the Netherlands, Martin Warneck Publishers,

Berlin; Arnold Gehlen, "Germandom and Christianity in Fichte," Junker & Dünnhaupt Publishers, Berlin 1935.

92. Paul Kluckhohn, "The Idea of the People in the Writings of the German Movement," Junker & Dünnhaupt Publishers, 1934; Emil Ritter, "Catholic-Conservative Heritage." A Selection for the Present. With a foreword by Abbot Ildefons Herwegen, O.S.B., Herder Publishers, Freiburg i. Br. 1934; Jakob Hommes, "Philosophy of Life and Education as National and Catholic Task," Herder Publishers, Freiburg i. Br. 1933; Alois Dempf, "Görres Speaks to Our Time." The Thinker and his Work, Herder Publishers, Freiburg i. Br. 1935; Taras Borodajkewycz, "German Spirit and Catholicism in the 19th Century." Presented through the Developmental Course of Konstantin von Höfler. Anton Pustet Publishers, Salzburg-Leipzig 1935.

93. Friedrich Lenz, "Friedrich List, the Man and the Work," Oldenbourg Publishers, Munich-Berlin 1936.

94. Othmar Spann, "On the Nature of Nationality," 1922; "Doctrine of Categories," 1924; "Doctrine of Society," 1925. Compare moreover Alfred Kirchhoff, "What is National?," p. 102.

95. "Wille und Macht," Issue 18, 1935: Rüdiger, "The Tasks of the New Fighter."

96. "The Coming German Revolution. Germany's Renewal," 1931, Issue 6, pp. 450 to 460.

97. Prof. Bortolotto (the significant state theorist of Fascism) in his writing "Fascism and Nation," translated into German by Mirgeler, Hanseatic Publishing House, Hamburg 1932.

98. "National Socialist Worldview," two essays from the years 1919 to 1923, and "On the Philosophical Foundation of National Socialism." Published in the writings of the "Deutsche Hochschule für Politik." I. "Idea and Form of National Socialism," Issue 17, Junker & Dünnhaupt Publishers, Berlin 1930.

"Beside Rosenberg's 'Myth-Philosophy,' as the center of National Socialist worldview, and beside Baeumler's 'Philosophy of Heroic Realism,' his 'Philosophy of the Divine in Nationality' will always have to be named as an essential exponent of National Socialist intellectual heritage." (Paul Junker in "Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte," 67, 1935, p. 1140: "The Divine in Nationality.")

99. Kurt Stavenhagen, "The Nature of the Nation," Hans Robert Engelmann Publishers, Berlin 1934.

100. Ibid., p. 172.

101. "The Christian Statesman, A Theology of National Socialism," pp. 246 ff., Hanseatic Publishing House, Hamburg 1932.

102. Matthes Ziegler, "Ecclesiastical or Religious Folklore?," "Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte," 65, 1935, 678 ff.; Leadership organ of the National Socialist youth, "Wille und Macht," Issue 18, 1935; Hasso Volker, "Deconfessionalization of Custom."

"Recently Reich Minister Dr. Frick demanded in Münster the deconfessionalization of all public life.

One must apply this demand in the very first place also to those expressions of the national soul which, as expression of blood and worldview, determine content and form of our national festivals and our ancient traditional celebrations in the life of the people, in the course of the year or in the course of human lives: the national customs.

Certainly, when we speak of national customs, it must be clear to us from the outset that in their present form we no longer have before us the pure heritage of our ancestors, but that in the course of centuries various falsifications and changes have been undertaken.

The demand for a separation of our customs according to racially inherent and racially alien features therefore becomes ever

more necessary, and with it also the demand for liberation of our ancient traditional customs from the influence of the Church."

103. Hans Keller, "The Third Europe," Batschari Publishers, Zurich-Paris-Berlin 1934.

104. "The Book of German Nationality." Nature-Living Space-Destiny. Edited by Paul Gauss. F. A. Brockhaus Publishers, Leipzig 1933.

105. "Mein Kampf," pp. 305 to 308, 459, and Eckart Weinreich, "The Nation as Life Community," pp. 72 to 105, Lehmann Publishers, Munich 1931.

106. Gottfried Feder, "The Program of the NSDAP," p. 19.

107. "National-Political Education," pp. 33 to 48, Armanen Publishers 1932, and "National Socialist Education." Founded on the Philosophy of Education. Publishing House A. W. Zickfeldt, Osterwieck am Harz, 1933.

108. "National-Political Anthropology," Vol. I, Armanen Publishers, Frankfurt am Main 1936.

109. Hans Eibl, "On the Meaning of the Present." A Book of German Mission. 2nd edition. Wilhelm Braumüller Publishers, Vienna 1933.

110. "German Unity," F. Bruckmann Publishers, Munich 1935. 2 volumes.

111. "Preußische Jahrbücher" (Treitschke Issue), 1934 (contains excerpts from his day-to-day political views 1860 to 1870).

112. Compare the judgments in Ignaz von Döllinger and Janssen.

113. The Protestant standpoint is clearly set forth in the book: "The Nation before God," On the Message of the Church in the Third Reich. Edited by Lic. Dr. Künneth and Prof. Dr. Helmuth Schreiner, 3rd edition, Wichern Publishers, Berlin.

114. Hans Frank, "National Socialist Handbook for Law and Legislation," 2nd edition, Franz Eher's Successor Publishers, Munich 1936 (foundational for the transformation of German legal life in the Third Reich); compare further the professional journal "Deutsche Rechtspflege," Organ of the League of National Socialist German Jurists, 1936, and the journal of the "Academy for German Law."

115. "Völkischer Beobachter," special issue on the anniversary of the seizure of power, January 30, 1936. (Essay by Wilhelm Stuckart on the special constitution of the Third Reich and the new basic state laws.)

116. Walther Merk, "On the Becoming and Nature of German Law," Hermann Beyer Publishers, Langensalza 1934; Koellreutter, "The German Leader State," 1934, and Knubben, "The National Socialist Leader and Totalitarian State in its Position toward the Weimar Basic Rights and Individualistic Human Rights," "Reichs- und preußisches Verwaltungsblatt," 1934, 774 ff.

117. Dr. Ruttke, "Racial Hygiene and Law," lecture delivered at the hereditary-biological-racial-hygienic course for psychiatrists in Munich, February 10, 1934.

118. Compare the essay by Prof. G. A. Walz, Breslau, "National Socialism and the League of Nations," in the journal "Völkerbund und Völkerrecht," December issue 1934.

119. Paul Brannhals, "The Organic Worldview," Vol. 1, pp. 117 to 124: "A general international law that would stand above the life-right of states, we must reject not only as a practical but also as a moral utopia. As life-form and moral personality, the state is an end in itself, responsible only to its own conscience."

120. "Mein Kampf," pp. 431 to 436, 451.

121. "Racial Legal Jurisprudence," pp. 34 to 41, 44 to 48, "Nationalsozialistische Bibliothek" and "The State in the National

Socialist Worldview," 1933. The author was later rejected by the Party, but not because of his constitutional legal views.

122. Especially his writing on "The Types of Legal-Scientific Thinking," "National Socialism and Constitutional State," another work "The Concept of the Political," Duncker & Humblot Publishers, Munich, has not insignificant differences in the assessment of the Russian council system in the two editions of the years 1932/33. Compare also "Schriften der Akademie für Deutsches Recht," published by the President of the Academy for German Law, Reich Justice Commissioner Dr. Hans Frank, Hanseatic Publishing House, Hamburg, reprinted in Issue 12/13 of the "Juristische Wochenschrift" of 1934.

123. Gustav Radbruch, "Paul Johann Anselm Feuerbach," Julius Springer Publishers, Vienna 1934.

124. Noteworthy is the following writing: Günther Krauss and Otto von Schweinichen, "Disputation on the Constitutional State." With an introduction and afterword by Carl Schmitt. Hanseatic Publishing House, Hamburg 1935.

125. Rudolf Laun, "Religion and Morality," Springer Publishers, Berlin 1932, rejects the idea of an abstract, universally valid "moral law" and declares state legislation as autonomous. Law and morality are one and the same. Against this the no less confused Spanish legal scholar Quintiliano Saldaña, Madrid, comes to the following conclusions: "For us law, that is, the concept of law, does not exist. There is no law, but rather laws. It is impossible to deny the empirically given fact of a natural law in conscience." Publishers for Political Science and History, Berlin 1935.

126. Compare Prof. Howald, "Culture of Antiquity," Athenaion Publishers, Potsdam 1935.

127. Günther, "Plato as Guardian of Life," Munich 1928.

128. Karl Larenz, "Legal and State Philosophy of the Present," Junker & Dünnhaupt Publishers, Berlin 1935; further the collection "Legal Idea and State Thought," Festschrift for Julius Binder, Junker & Dünnhaupt Publishers, Berlin 1934, especially Vol. II; Franz W. Jerusalem, Jena, wants in his new book "The State, A Contribution to the Doctrine of the State," Gustav Fischer Publishers, Jena 1935, to newly ground constitutional legal basic concepts from the knowledge of their sociological significance for the various state types: I. The Community State (1. The Germanic National State; 2. The Retinue State). II. The Individualistic State (1. The Corporate State; 2. The Sovereign Princely State). III. The State of National Representation (1. The French State after the Revolution; 2. The Constitutional State in Germany). IV. The State of the National Community (Germany since the National Socialist Revolution).

129. Eckart Weinreich, "The Role of the Leader," "Deutschlands Erneuerung," 1932, Issue 3, pp. 134 to 141: "To the retinue the leader is the highest man, to the mass the leader is a god."

130. Otto Koellreutter, "People and State in the Worldview of National Socialism," Pan Publishers, Berlin-Charlottenburg 1935.

131. Program of National Socialism, Point 19: "We demand replacement of Roman law, which serves the materialistic world order, with a German common law."

132. How much room is given to fantasy is shown by the book by Walter Merk, "Eike von Repgow and his Time," August Hopfer Publishers, Burg bei Magdeburg 1934.

133. "Principles of Roman Law," Duncker & Humblot Publishers, Munich 1934.

134. German law is said to be subjective, Roman law objective (Adolf Schmidt, Kahn), the former a social law and a law of legal rules (Wegemann, Gierke), the former law is tender, the Roman

harder, more factual, more sober and individual (Der Rembrandtdeutsche), the former is said to be a peasant law, the latter that of the city (Brunner, Hugelmann).

135. "Nature and Content of the Political Constitution." By Professor Dr. Huber. In the series "Der deutsche Staat der Gegenwart" published by Staatsrat Carl Schmitt (published by Hanseatic Publishing House, Hamburg), Issue 10.

136. Compare Richard Thurnwald's new book: "Becoming, Change and Formation of State and Culture in the Light of Ethnographic Research," Walter de Gruyter Publishers, Berlin 1935; the fourth volume of his large-scale work "Human Society in its Ethno-Sociological Foundations"; further C. A. Emge, "Ideas toward a Philosophy of Leadership," in the Rudolf Stammler Festschrift, Publishers for Political Science and History, Berlin 1936.

137. Compare the speech of SS Reich Leader Heinrich Himmler at the Reich Peasant Congress in Goslar 1933 on the Order of Nordically Determined Men (men's league on racial foundation), partially published in the weekly "Das Schwarze Korps," 43rd sequence.

138. R. Walther Darré, "Renewal of Nobility or New Nobility?," "Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte," 1931, Issue 17, pp. 337 to 347. "Germany needs a new leadership stratum. The families whose members have proven themselves as leaders should form the new nobility." Further the same in the writing: "New Nobility from Blood and Soil," pp. 9 to 13. J. F. Lehmann Publishers, Munich 1936: "The essential content of the genuine German concept of nobility in the Germanic sense is consciously bred leadership on the basis of select hereditary substance." "We must bring a genuine nobility for our people back to life."

139. Gustav Gundlach, "The Order in Political Space," "Stimmen der Zeit," March issue 1935.

140. Giuseppe Lo Verde, "The Doctrine of the State in New Italy" (Social and Constitutional Legal Doctrine), Junker & Dünnhaupt Publishers, Berlin 1934. The last sections treat: Fascist State and Catholic Church, Influences from East and West, The Fascist State Form.

141. Italy sees the state in the nation, France in the soil, England in society, Germany in blood, that is, in common descent; compare Alfred Rosenberg, "Crisis and Reconstruction of Europe," Junker & Dünnhaupt Publishers, Berlin ("Schriften der deutschen Hochschule für Politik," Issue 5).

142. Karl Braunias, "The Basic and Civil Rights according to the Encyclicals of the Recent Popes," "Zeitschrift für öffentliches Recht," XV, Issue 5, 1935; Kurt Schilling, "The State, its Spiritual Foundations, its Origin and Development," Ernst Reinhardt Publishers, Munich 1935. This attempt to philosophically ground the problem "Individual and state community" did not succeed.

143. Compare the writing: "Individual and Community according to St. Thomas Aquinas." By P. Edelbert Kurz, O.F.M. Kösel & Pustet Publishers, Munich 1933.

What does Thomas Aquinas say to the burning controversial question of our time: Individual or community? Man for the state or the state for man? Kurz perhaps out of deference to contemporary currents contradicts all those who with de Wulf want to find in Thomas the teaching: "Every community exists only for the individual," and asserts, allowing the standpoint to be prescribed too much by apologetic tendency, "Thus St. Thomas goes throughout in our question with Aristotle: Above the individual stands the community as his goal and whole." Thomas did not correct Aristotle, but rather completed him in the sense that the individual is free vis-à-vis the state in those things in which the state is no longer of the same kind with him, thus in things of eternal salvation. Whoever

wants to see individualism in Thomas must purely arbitrarily restrict the concept of community merely to the earthly community of the state. Only the eternal value of the individual soul stands above the duties toward the state community, but otherwise Thomas's word applies: The common good is better and more divine than the good of one, if both are in the same genus. The whole difficult question still requires thorough moral-theological investigations to refute the reproach of individual National Socialist writers that Christian moral teaching is based only on an individualistic personality culture. Perhaps there is also too generalized an equation of state and community.

144. Stapel, "National Civic Education," Hanseatic Publishing House, Hamburg, 3rd edition.

145. Walter Gehl, Berlin, "The National Socialist State, Foundations and Formation, Documents of Construction, Speeches and Lectures up to November 12, 1933."

146. From Günther Holstein and from the Hegelian Karl Larenz appeared a "State Philosophy" (as special edition from the "Handbook of Philosophy"). Holstein treats Antiquity, Middle Ages and Western Europe to Rousseau, Larenz the legal and state philosophy of German Idealism (Oldenbourg Publishers, Munich 1933). Compare "Hegel Today." A Selection from Hegel's Political Thought. Felix Meiner Publishers, Leipzig 1934.

147. Ernst Forsthoff, "The Total State," Hanseatic Publishing House, Hamburg 1934, was the first constitutional legal scholar to describe the nature of a new German state system in formulations that seem suitable only for the leadership of a youth league, but not of a modern state system.

148. "The Church of Christ and the State of Hitler," p. 65, Hanseatic Publishing House, Hamburg 1932.

149. "Völkischer Beobachter," on January 9, 1934.

150. "The Standard of Living of the Intellectually Creative and the New Germany," Albert Langen & Georg Müller Publishers, Munich 1935.

151. Thomas Michels, "The Salvific Value of the Church," p. 40, Anton Pustet Publishers, Salzburg 1935: "It is in no way comprehensible that today the attempt is again being made to separate the political and the ecclesiastical from each other, and that there are Catholics who tacitly or expressly approve such a procedure... Every politics that does not ultimately aim at the eternal is no politics that has right of existence in the Christian order of salvation."

152. Heinrich Rommen, "The State in Catholic Thought," Bonifatius Press, Paderborn 1935.

153. Partially this conceptual confusion also exists in individual circles of Fascism and the French Action, when words of the Christian religion are reinterpreted into the political (martyrs, holy blood, trinity, mysticism of political forces); compare the journal of Fascism published in Milan.

154. Fascism, whose intellectual-historical roots come to light in the state philosophy of Antiquity and the Italian Middle Ages, attempts to bring the ideas of the stato corporativo, of the thought of authority and power, of universalism and totality, into a bearable tension with the doctrine of Christian state consciousness. Compare Adolf Menzel, "The State Idea of Fascism." An Intellectual-Historical Investigation. Franz Deuticke Publishers, Vienna-Leipzig 1935.

155. Hermann Nohl, "The Pedagogical Movement in Germany and its Theory," Gerhard Schulte-Bulmke Publishers, Frankfurt am Main 1933 (objectively held).

156. "National Socialist Education," pp. 143 to 150.

157. "Philosophy and Education," pp. 280 ff., Diederichs Publishers, Jena 1922; further "Science, Worldview, University Reform," Armanen Publishers, Leipzig-Frankfurt am Main 1934, and "National Socialist Education," Armanen Publishers 1932.

158. "Rhein-Mainische Volkszeitung," 1926, No. 289, 290:

"The uncritical matter-of-factness with which today frequently from every Catholic the commitment to the Catholic school is demanded as if it were a criterion of his Catholicity—which in practice exists as little as a Catholic politics—unfortunately allows one to fear that even in leading school-political circles one is not conscious of the demonstrated national-political and religious responsibility, but rather assumes that if this school is confessionally secured, everything will come by itself."

On the whole question compare E. Przywara in "Stimmen der Zeit," 111, 1926, pp. ff.: "Whither!"

159. "The confessional school is impossible for him from the pedagogical, scientific and psychological standpoint." ("Vossische Zeitung," 1926, No. 70.)

160. O. Eberhard, "World Education Movement. Forces and Counter-Forces in the International Movement," Berlin, Furche Publishers 1930.

161. Compare Marga Kapp, "The Intellectual Foundations of Fascist School Reform," Issue 4 of the series "Educational-Scientific Investigations" edited by Fischer, Kroh and Luchtenberg, Felix Meiner Publishers, Leipzig.

162. "Reichswart, National Socialist Weekly," 18th year, No. 7, Berlin 1934.

163. This assessment of Schleiermacher in no way corresponds to the real picture of his Christian thoroughly positive, dogmatically felt piety.

164. The demand for a new national culture was also raised by Alfred Rosenberg at a lecture in the Hall of Mirrors of the Berlin Kroll Opera on December 17, 1934 at the meeting of the Reich office leadership of the National Socialist cultural community with the leading personalities of the National Socialist formations and associations: "A struggle for the unity of National Socialist thought must be carried forward uncompromisingly. Our task is, in slow selection, to raise and promote the positive forces that could form a new emerging German culture (art) in the spirit of the movement."

165. Compare Peter Petersen, "The New European Educational Movement," Weimar 1926; "European Educational Reform since the World War" (prepared by the Reich Ministry of the Interior), Leipzig 1924.

An overview of this world movement is given by the Frenchman A. Ferrière in the writing "École active" published in 1922 (German translation in "Pädagogik des Auslandes," Vol. 1, Weimar 1928).

166. Josef Schroteler, "Educational Responsibility, Educational Right," Kösel-Pustet Publishers, 1933, and Arnold Rademacher, "Religion and Education," Peter Hanstein Publishers, Bonn 1933.

167. Johann Peter Steffes, "Religion and Politics," Herder Publishers, Freiburg 1929, and Leopold Kopler, "Religion and Politics," Academic Press Association Printing House, Linz 1929, on the Protestant side valuable Richard Benz, "Spirit and Reich, Concerning the Determination of the German," Eugen Diederichs Publishers, Jena 1933.

168. Reich Minister Kerrl, "National Socialism and Faith," lecture on October 10, 1933 at the reception of the Economic Council of the German Academy.

169. Theodor Haecker, "Christianity and Culture," Kösel-Pustet Publishers, Munich; Johannes Messner, "The Social Question," Tyrolia Publishers 1933.

170. According to Bolshevist view, "Religion is an enemy of culture," "Hochland," 1927 to 1929, pp. 44 ff. Essay by Wilh. Moog.

171. Hans Severus Ziegler, "Practical Cultural Work in the Third Reich, Suggestions and Guidelines for Healthy National Education," Franz Eher Publishers, Munich 1932.

172. Julius Binder, "Reason of State and Morality," Junker & Dünnhaupt Publishers, Berlin 1933, treats in detail the problem of politics and morality.

173. Compare from the most recent time on Fascist efforts Restrepo, "Concordata vigentia," Romae 1934, p. 592.

174. Journal "Evangelische Theologie," March issue, Chr. Kaiser Publishers, Munich 1935; Martin Niemöller on the service of the Church to the people; further Max Huber, "The Christian and Politics" in "Rufe der Zeit," Berner-Münster Lectures, Publishers of the Evangelical Society in Berlin 1935; Alfred de Quervain, "The Theological Presuppositions of Politics," Berlin 1931.

175. A position toward the question of political Catholicism incompatible with Catholic sensibility is taken by Ernst Michel (Catholic) when in his book "On the Ecclesiastical Mission of the Laity," Lambert Schneider Publishers, Berlin 1934, he believes the Church has all too long in medieval fashion sought to enforce a world formation in the sense of the Church by postulating Catholic morality, Catholic scholarship and the Christian state. Such claims would today be rejected as "political Catholicism" in Europe.

176. Compare the valuable essay by C. Kaufmann, "Political Catholicism" in the journal "Der Fels," Issue 10, Frankfurt am Main 1934/35.

177. Characteristic is the handwriting of Pope Pius X of October 30, 1906 to Cardinal Archbishop Fischer in Cologne: "Not less was the satisfaction," it says in that papal handwriting, "which We have drawn from the repeatedly expressed assurance that the German Catholics want to follow the authority of the Apostolic See in all religious matters. Even if some who do not know the truth have vehemently turned against it, this obedience, as continuous experience shows, leaves to each one complete and unrestricted freedom in those matters which do not concern religion."

On March 4, 1907, a resolution was adopted unanimously by the delegates of all Catholic party organizations that emphasized that the Center Party as a political, non-confessional party in purely political matters is independent of the judgment of church superiors.

Exactly as the Catholic parties have done in Germany, so have the Christian Socials always held in Austria. "I would only wish for the Social Democrats that they were as little dependent on the Jews as we are on the Catholic clergy," declared Dr. Lueger on July 3, 1902 in the Vienna City Council. With justification Lueger's long-time fellow fighter and biographer, Franz Stauracz, refers in his Lueger book (Braumüller, Vienna 1907) to the statement made by an opponent of the Christian Social Party: "Never have the Christian Socials received the commands of their political conduct from Rome; they demonstrate understanding for the position of the clergy in the life of our peoples, but they have never bowed under the dictate of the bishops."

On the other hand, Reich Chancellor Bismarck attempted precisely in the struggle over the "Septennat" to have the Center influenced by the Church against Windthorst's will.

Compare the documentary presentation of these events in Boehtlingk, "Bismarck und das päpstliche Rom," pp. 183 to 187.

178. Compare his writing "Plus ultra, Fate of a German Catholic 1862 to 1882" (1883): "I regard the political Catholicism of the Center Party as a religious misfortune for the Catholic Church and as a true national misfortune for the German Reich."

J. Mayer, "Baumstark und Alban Stolz," Freiburger Diocesan Archive. New Series XXVI (appeared as special print 1928). Similar thoughts in Karl Jentsch, Franz Xaver Kraus, Martin Spahn, Wilhelm von Hoensbroech, von Schorlemer-Lieser, von Lüninck, etc.

179. Compare Paul Hazard, "La Crise de conscience Européenne," Paris 1935.

180. Gustav Kossinna, "German Prehistory, an Eminently National Science," Kurt Kabitzsch Publishers, Leipzig.

Among the actual new publications, the work by Wolfgang Schultz, "Old Germanic Culture in Word and Image," J. F. Lehmann Publishers, Munich, is the most important. It is a large-scale, although partially somewhat one-sided image of the world and nature of the Germans, as has scarcely been offered in this completeness before.

181. "Origin and Racial History of the Germans," pp. 162 ff., Lehmann Publishers, Munich 1935. The cultural-political proposals of Hans Friedrich Blunck, who has taken over the leadership of the Chamber for Literature, move in this sense, "Deutsche Kulturpolitik," pp. 20/21, Albert Langen-Georg Müller Publishers, Munich 1935, with strong "German faithful" sentiments. The same spirit permeates the Reich statutes of the "German educators" ("Nationalsozialistische Lehrerzeitung"), 1934, Issue 4, p. 16 (Old Germania's Reawakening).

Much more sober and objective in contrast are the results of the significant religious historian Carl Clemen, "Old Germanic Religious History," Ludwig Röhrscheid Publishers, Bonn 1934.

182. In "Neuland" two essays. Albert Langen—Georg Müller Publishers, Munich 1935.

183. Text in "Völkischer Beobachter," 1934, No. 292.

184. Compare the following writings: Walter F. Otto, "The Spirit of Antiquity and the Christian World"; Gustav Neckel, "The Old Germanic Religion," Hermann Wendt Publishers, Berlin; Andreas Heusler, "Germandom," Carl Winter Publishers, Heidelberg; Gottfried Spanuth, "Faith and Culture of Our Ancestors," Kurt Stenger Publishers, Erfurt, and "The Old Germanic Religion and Christianity," Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Publishers, Göttingen; Hans Naumann, "The Gods of Germania," in "Wandlung und Erfüllung," J. B. Metzler Publishing House, Stuttgart; Walter F. Otto, "The Gods of Greece," Gerhard Schulte-Bulmke Publishers, Frankfurt am Main.

185. Josef Schnitzer, "Original Sin in the Light of Religious History," a religio-historical and dogma-historical treatise, Bologna 1931.

186. "Fundamental Features of the Racial and Spatial History of the German People," p. 258, J. F. Lehmann Publishers, Munich 1935.

187. Compare the old scholastic principle: Whatever is received, is received according to the mode of the receiver.

188. Will Vesper in: "Die neue Literatur," p. 147, March 1934.

189. Hans Freyer, Königsberg, "Idea and Existence," Hanseatic Publishing House, Hamburg 1935.

190. In "Die deutsche Volkskunde," edited by Prof. Adolf Spamer, Reich leader of the Department of Folklore in the Reich Community of German Ethnographic Research, pp. 600 ff., Bibliographical Institute, Leipzig, and Herbert Stubenrauch, Berlin

1933; further Hermann Buddensieg, "What is German!," Bündischer Publishers, Heidelberg 1934.

191. "Deutsche Gottschau," Karl Gutbrod Publishers, Stuttgart 1934.

192. Hans Naumann, Willy Andreas, Adolf Feulner, Gerhard Fricke and Erich Rothacker, "Der deutsche Mensch," Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, Stuttgart 1935. Similar thoughts in the special issue of "Süddeutsche Monatshefte," "Imprints of Germanic Religiosity," Munich 1934.

193. Details in A. Gisler, "Modernism," pp. 27 ff., Benzinger Publishers, Einsiedeln, versus "Americanism."

194. Compare the noteworthy essay by Johannes Haller, "Germandom and Christianity," in the scholarly journal "Geistige Arbeit," No. 3 of February 5, 1934.

195. Ludwig Schmidt, "The East Germans, History of the German Tribes until the End of the Migration Period," C. H. Beck Publishers, Munich 1934.

196. Heinrich Horstenkamp, "Medieval Imperial Policy in German Historiography," Emil Ebering Publishers, Berlin 1934. In the "Historischen Studien," published by Dr. Emil Ebering, Issue 285. Heinrich Günter, "The Medieval Empire," Munich 1935; Leopold Ziegler, "The Holy Book of the Germans," Darmstadt 1925; the same, "The Emerging Germandom and Rome," C. H. Beck Publishers, Munich 1934; "Not Rome-rejection stands behind the attitude of a Notker and Widukind, but rather lack of knowledge about the essential."

197. On the question compare the "Collection of Contributions on Charlemagne or Charlemagne," E. S. Mittler Publishers, Berlin 1935.

198. Richard von Kralik in his "Kulturstudien," which, although written 30 years ago, are timely as if they were just written yesterday.

199. "Kämpfende Wissenschaft," by Walter Frank. With a foreword by Reich Youth Leader Baldur von Schirach. Hanseatic Publishing House, Hamburg 1934. The writing, in form a memorial speech on Heinrich von Treitschke, is simultaneously a program of what the National Socialist revolution demands from historical science, and a critique of what the German historian generation of the pre-war period, the epigones of Ranke and Treitschke, have "accomplished" for national historiography.

200. Theodor Steinbüchel, "Christliches Mittelalter," Jakob Hegner Publishers, Leipzig 1934.

201. Alfred Müller, "Rome in German History, A Thousand Years of Tragedy," Schwertschmiede Publishers, Stuttgart 1934; especially belonging to this literature are the numerous anti-Rome writings of the Tannenberg League (General Ludendorff).

202. "Grundlagen," p. 515.

203. Karl Zimmermann, "German History as Racial Destiny," Quelle & Meyer Publishers, Leipzig 1934. Johannes von Leers, "History on Racial Foundation," Reclam, Leipzig 1934.

204. Albert Werminghoff, "National Church Efforts in the Middle Ages," Stuttgart 1910; Ulrich Stutz, "The Private Church as Element of Medieval Germanic Church Law," Berlin 1898; Karl Heintrich, "National Catholicism," Hanseatic Publishing House, Hamburg; "German Catholicism in the Declining and Coming Reich" (written by Catholic [?] theologians), published by Count E. Reventlow, Reichswart Publishers, Berlin 1932.

205. Compare in the Code of Canon Law the sections: Recognition of kinship, private church system, vows, bequests.

206. Compare the excellent writings by Prelate Schreiber, Münster; further Hans Koren, "National Customs in the Church Year." A Handbook. 2nd edition, Anton Pustet Publishers, Salzburg-Leipzig 1935. (With text illustrations by E. Dombrowski and an image appendix of religious folk customs); Anton Stonner, "The German Soul in Christian-German Folk Custom," Kösel-Pustet Publishers, Munich 1935.

Both works are unintentionally an apology of Christianity against the "German Faith Movement," and indeed a far better and more effective one than the theoretical writings and articles from the pen of Protestant theologians. "Germanic paganism" is not overcome through angry polemic, but rather through loving recognition and cultivation of its natural truth content, as has always corresponded to the great pedagogical wisdom of the Catholic Church (Friedrich Heiler).

207. In this sense, despite loyal ecclesiastical sentiment, St. Clement Maria Hofbauer complained in the days of Metternich's state-church system: "The Germans are not understood." (Cited according to Ernst Karl Winter, "Anton Günther" in "Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft," 88, 1930, p. 328.)

208. Compare my book, "Die Deutsche Kulturarbeit in Italien," Aschendorff Publishers, Münster 1934.

IV. CONCLUSION.

1. "Idea and Existence." Hanseatic Publishing House, Hamburg 1936.

2. "The Essential Structure of National Socialism," pp. 5-10.

3. Compare the glorification of Ulrich von Hutten by the German Catholic movement of Ronge (Treitschke, "Deutsche Geschichte," Vol. II, p. 591).

4. Journal "Die neue Literatur," January 1934.

5. Gerhardt Kuhlmann, "Theology at the Crossroads," J. C. Mohr Publishers, Tübingen 1935.

6. "Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte," September issue, 1934.

7. Through the new reform of Education Minister de Vecchi, the philosophical training of university youth also appears to be directed into other channels.

8. Noteworthy are the following statements in the journal for a Nordic faith world: "Flammenzeichen," 8, 1934, No. 39, Leonberg, Stuttgart: "Spiritually seen, the Gothic cathedrals that stand in the space of Europe must appear to us more or less as ruins, in which admittedly certain religious feeling-contents still come to expression and perhaps will for a longer time yet, but which never and nevermore have the power to build something new, which live on like a memory from past times, but no longer have formative and liberating power. The counter-religion of Moscow no longer takes the Christianity of the West seriously, with justification, from here no more danger threatens it."

9. Waldemar Gurian, "Bolshevism as World Danger," Via-nova Publishers, Lucerne 1935, and "Bolshevism, Introduction to History and Doctrine," Herder Publishers, Freiburg 1931.

10. Valuable thoughts on family and marriage, which are partially felt in a Christian manner, are expressed by Florentine Samm, "Woman in Germany's Decline and Rise," "National-sozialistische Monatshefte," 22, 1932, pp. 1 to 19.

11. Peter Burger, "Fascism and National Socialism, a Comparison of the Intellectual Foundations," Reinhold Publishers, Vienna 1934; Fr. Valsecchi, "Modern Italy. Political Intellectual History since 1900," Hanseatic Publishing House, Hamburg 1934;

Otto Bangert, "German Revolution. A Book on the Struggle for the Third Reich," pp. 168 to 173, Franz Eher Publishers, Munich 1931.

12. "Fascism is a religious worldview, in which man is seen in his inherent relationship to a higher law, to an objective knowledge, which transcends the individual and raises him to consciousness of his spiritual community." Vol. 14 of the "Italian Encyclopedia." Mussolini's Fascism partially coincides with Carl Schmitt's "concept of the political."

13. Hans Naumann, "Charles Maurras and the Worldview of the Action Française" ("Studien und Bibliographie zur Gegenwartsphilosophie," Vol. 13), F. Hirzel Publishers, Leipzig.

14. Henri Cazelles, "Église et État en Allemagne, de Weimar aux premières années du III. Reich," Rousseau & Cie., Paris 1936; on a middle line without polemic moves the writing of the Italian Mario Bendiscioli, "Germania religiosa nel III. Reich," Morcelliana, Brescia 1936.

15. The words of the then Vice-Chancellor Franz von Papen in Gleiwitz (1934) have lost nothing of their timeliness even after two years: "Against racial research and racial care aimed at preserving a people's distinctive character and awakening the sense of national community, there is certainly nothing to object to. This love for one's own race will never degenerate into hatred against other peoples or races. That is decisive, and this racial care must never be brought into conflict with Christianity, for race and Christianity are not opposites, but only different orders. Christianity first made a German people out of the German tribes, and it is truly not necessary to establish a new Nordic-Germanic religion in order to profess our nationality."

16. Different is Alfred Rosenberg, "Crisis and Rebirth of Europe," lecture at the Volta Congress in Rome (November 10, 1932).

VI. BIBLIOGRAPHY.

From the leading National Socialist literature that was processed in this work, some works may be especially named here that could not be included in the bibliography of the notes for lack of space, but are indeed utilized in the book. Several works appeared in the Central Publishers of the NSDAP, Franz Eher's Successor, Munich.

Naturally the main journals of the movement with the special issues on all important questions were constantly consulted, so that they need not be named here a second time.

"Die nationalsozialistische Revolution," Junker & Dünnhaupt Publishers, Berlin 1930.

"Adolf Hitler's Speeches," edited by Dr. E. Boepple (Historically memorable speeches, 1922 to 1924).

Philipp Bouhler, "Education in the National Socialist State."

The same, "Basic Forms of National Education."

Rudolf Jung, "National Socialism, its Foundations, its Development, its Goals."

Ernst Krieck, "Education in the National Socialist State."

The same, "Philosophy of Education."

The same, "The State of the German Man."

J. Kuptsch, "Christianity in National Socialism."

The same, "In the Third Reich to the Third Church."

Prof. Lenz, "On the Biological Foundations of Education."

Alfred Rosenberg, "Blood and Honor, A Struggle for German Rebirth," Part I; "Shaping of the Idea," Part II.

The same, "Essential Structure of National Socialism, the Foundations of a German Rebirth."

Hjalmar Schacht, "Principles of German Economic Policy."

Prof. Ludwig Schemann, "Race in the Humanities, Studies on the History of Racial Thought."

The Foundations of National Socialism

In this comprehensive theological and political analysis, Bishop Alois Hudal examines the intellectual foundations, historical development, and doctrinal claims of National Socialism from the perspective of a Catholic theologian writing in 1936.

Spanning eleven systematically ordered sections, *The Foundations of National Socialism* traces the movement's philosophical antecedents, from its roots in German Romantic nationalism and racial theory to its articulation as a comprehensive worldview. Hudal analyzes the concept of "Positive Christianity," the role of race in National Socialist ideology, the Jewish question, eugenic policies, and theories of nationhood and statehood. He engages with the movement's claims regarding law, leadership, education, and the totalitarian state, while addressing the complex relationship between German national identity, Roman Catholicism, and political life.

The work concludes with extensive documentation of National Socialist and related scholarly literature, providing a detailed bibliographic apparatus for researchers.

This volume represents a significant primary source for historians, theologians, and students of twentieth-century European political thought seeking to understand Catholic intellectual engagement with National Socialism during the critical pre-war period.

Contained in this Volume:

Introduction · The Development of the Movement · Religious, Moral & Historico-Philosophical Doctrines · Concluding Remarks · Extensive Annotations & Bibliography

Claude Sonnet 4.5

Machine Translation